DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 548 CS 501 463

AUTHOR	Lynn, Elizabeth M.
TITLE	Improving Classroom Communication: Speech Communication Instruction for Teachers.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.; Speech Communication Association, Falls Church, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
CONTRACT	400-75-0029
NOTE	135p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Va. 22041 ($3.95 members, $4.50 non-members)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 PC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; *Classroom Communication; *Course Content; Educational Programs; Instructional Design; National Surveys; Resource Materials; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

Recognition of the importance of the classroom as a communication environment, in which the teaching/learning process relies upon the interactive behaviors of speaking and listening, has contributed to the rapid multiplication over the past few years of courses in classroom communication. This publication, designed for educational planners (including governmental and private funding agencies) and for speech department personnel concerned with providing teacher communication programs, deals with the prevalence, design, and content of classroom communication courses; commonly used instructional strategies; instructors' qualifications; model courses; and the effectiveness of such courses. Included are an annotated bibliography of resource materials for course development and lists of schools surveyed for course offerings, both undergraduate and graduate. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED126548

Improving Classroom Communication: Speech Communication Instruction for Teachers

Elizabeth M. Lynn
Case Western Reserve University

Resources Section by David C. Kleiman
Northwestern University

Speech Communication Association
5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

CS 501 463

Speech Communication Association Publications Board David Mortensen, University of Wisconsin/Madison, Chairman/Carroll Arnold, Pennsylvania State University/Rita C. Naremore, Indiana University, Bloomington/Russel R. Windes, Queens College, New York/William Work, Executive Secretary, Speech Communication Association **Consultant Readers** Gustav W. Friedrich, Purdue University/Betty J. Haslett, University of Delaware/Carroll Arnold, Pennsylvania State University

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 76-29262
Published October 1976

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

Speech Communication Association
5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Printed in the United States of America

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Speech Communication Association for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Speech Communication Association or the National Institute of Education.

Contents

Foreword vii

Preface ix

Introduction 1

1. A Rationale for the Development of Courses in Classroom Communication 4

A Rationale from the Field of Education 4

Research on Classroom Communication from the Field of Education 8

A Rationale from the Field of Speech Communication 11

Research on Classroom Communication from the Field of Speech Communication 19

Obstacles to Course Development and Countering Conditions 22

State Certification Requirements for Teachers 25

Anticipated Governmental Support of Research and Instruction 27

2. Current Status of Courses and Programs in Classroom Communication 30

Current Communication Instruction for Teachers 30

National Survey Findings 31

University Programs of Special Interest 51

Short-Term Inservice Instruction 55

Guides to Resources 57

3. Questions and Answers **58**

4. Conclusion **63**

Notes **66**

Resources, by David C. Kleiman **79**

Appendixes **119**

A. Schools Selected for Anderson's Study 119

B. Schools Selected for Lynn's Study 123

Foreword

The teaching-learning process is essentially a communication process, one which relies heavily upon the interactive behaviors of speaking and listening. While students also use written communication as a primary means of learning, their motivational "sets," reinterpretations of written sources, and applications of written knowledge are shaped largely through oral communication with teachers, peers, family, and others. Only recently have educators begun to view the classroom as a communication environment in which there is the need to develop in one's self and one's students effective speaking and listening behaviors. In the past decade, a great deal of research and instruction on classroom communication has been reported both within and beyond the ERIC system. Indeed, one of the fastest growing programs in teacher preparation institutions is "communication for teachers."

This information analysis monograph, published by the Speech Communication Association in cooperation with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, reports the status nationally of instruction in speech communication for teachers. The book is written in response to a directive from the National Institute of Education (NIE) that ERIC provide educators with opportunities for knowledge utilization beyond that provided by the ERIC data base. NIE, recognizing the gap between educational research and classroom teaching, has charged ERIC to go beyond its initial function of gathering, evaluating, indexing, and disseminating information. Through the process of commissioning from recognized authorities information analysis papers, ERIC attempts to provide answers to the question "Where are we?" in relation to significant issues in education. Authors sometimes

find order in disparate approaches and often point to new directions for research and teaching.

In *Improving Classroom Communication*, Elizabeth Lynn, who has surveyed and developed programs on communication for teachers, offers significant information for educational planners and for the speech department personnel concerned with providing teacher communication programs. Both the analysis and the related resource section by David Kleiman provide vital information for administrators, methods course instructors, state departments of education, principals, district supervisors, and of course, for the teachers themselves—in short, for anyone vitally concerned with communication in educational contexts.

Barbara Lieb-Brilhart
Associate Director, ERIC/RCS

Preface

Courses in classroom communication encompass the theory and skills specifically associated with the processes of verbal interaction between teachers and students. With steadily growing support from both the speech communication and education professions, such courses have multiplied rapidly over the past few years. It is the purpose of this publication (1) to establish a sound rationale, derived and synthesized from the speech communication and education professions, for developing and offering such instruction; and (2) to facilitate the growth and expansion of such interdisciplinary instruction by describing the national status of courses in classroom communication and by identifying those resources which might further assist in instructional development. To promote the development of courses in classroom communication, this publication deals with such elements as the prevalence of these courses, their design, the kinds of content and instructional strategies most commonly used, instructors' qualifications, model courses, and the efficacy of such courses. In addition, this publication presents a bibliography of resource materials for course development.

This publication is intended primarily for use by departmental administrators and instructional developers from both the speech communication and education fields. The rationale and course descriptions are offered to assist these readers in convincing their colleagues:

1. that prospective and practicing classroom teachers have special needs for instruction in the skills of classroom communication;
2. that such skills and awareness are not innate, but must and can be learned through appropriate instruction and practice;
3. that the scope and diversity of a teacher's communication needs

cannot be met *solely* through traditional education courses (such as "Foundations of Education" or "Introduction to Teaching"), nor through traditional speech communication courses (such as "Public Speaking" or "Oral Interpretation");
4. that courses need to be tailored to address teachers' special communication needs;
5. that the study of speech communication processes has a necessary relationship to understanding and improving teacher-student and student-student interactions in the classroom.

In addition, this publication has been written for governmental and private funding agencies who are concerned with the preparation and continued education of teachers. The information provided is intended to assist such agencies in acquiring a clearer understanding of the contributions which the speech communication field can make to teacher education. As an outcome, it is hoped that these agencies will recognize the merit of funding proposals to initiate such courses or to make them more readily available to teachers.

The author would like to extend grateful appreciation to those individuals and institutions who participated in the dissertation research reported in Chapter 2; to Douglas Pedersen, Robert Wolsch, and Paul Batty for their continued interest in this work; and especially to Gene Anderson for permission to make extensive reference to his standard-setting research. Special acknowledgments are due to Betty Haslett, Gustav Friedrich, and Carroll Arnold for reading a draft of this work and offering thoughtful, useful suggestions, as well as to Barbara Lieb-Brilhart for the wide range of assistance which she provided throughout the research and writing. In particular, acknowledgment is given to David Kleiman for his diligent hard work in compiling and annotating the outstanding collection of interdisciplinary resources, for his perceptive comments on an early draft, and overall, for his enthusiastic and immensely helpful participation in this project.

Introduction

Within the past few years, the interdisciplinary expansion of the field of speech communication has provoked major changes in contemporary instruction in communication. The study of rhetoric, once confined to written and spoken messages of a formal nature, now encompasses all symbolic interaction directed toward human inducement.[1] Contemporary rhetorical studies probe such diverse forms of human inducement as patriotic songs, protest demonstrations, advertising campaigns, and informal communication of all sorts. Mass communication scholars, in conjunction with sociologists and psychologists, are intently exploring the effects of media upon human behavior. Specialists in organizational communication are working with management teams to improve interpersonal working relationships and communication within corporations. Interpersonal communication and intercultural communication have acquired academic identities as serious subjects for interdisciplinary research.

Concurrently and in line with these expanding interests of its membership, the Speech Communication Association (SCA) has changed its image as an organization primarily concerned with orality and is creating in its stead a cross-disciplinary organization "concerned with the scientific and humanistic study of human communication processes and with ways to learn to improve one's skills at communication."[2] In short, the field of speech communication today has come to involve the holistic study of human communication processes, synthesizing and interpreting pertinent research in communication from a wide assortment of fields, including psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, socio- and psycholinguistics, the biomedical professions, and education.

Similarly, the concerns of speech communication education have grown far beyond the preparation of just "speech" teachers in the

traditional sense. Contemporary speech pedagogy and research commonly encompass (1) the development of instruction in speech communication for all ages, grades, and occupations; (2) the development of teaching materials and instructional media; and (3) the study and analysis of the processes of speech communication in educational settings. Efforts are now being made to teach the theory and skills of classroom communication to teachers of subjects other than speech communication.

Interest in the study of classroom communication has evolved as a consequence of developments in several academic fields. Speech educators have long expressed concern over the inadequate training available to teachers of subjects other than speech communication (hereafter called "non-speech" teachers) to improve their own communication knowledge and skills and to instruct students in basic knowledge and skills in communication. In recent years, research in education, psychology, social psychology, sociology, and sociolinguistics has shed new light and focused widespread attention upon an assortment of factors which appear to influence classroom interaction and, possibly, students' learning. This research knowledge, coupled with the growing recognition of teachers' communication needs, has led to a rapid growth of education courses dealing specifically with classroom communication.

The phrase "classroom communication" encompasses the verbal and nonverbal interaction between teacher and students and between or among students.[1] To some degree, educators of teachers have always tried to teach certain principles of classroom communication to their students, but lack of class time, insufficient background of instructors, and education course priorities have sharply limited the instruction in communication available to classroom teachers. Aggravating this situation is the fact that far more useful, pertinent knowledge about communication processes has become available in the past decade than can easily be incorporated into traditionally available education courses.

To improve education in communication, interdisciplinary specialists in classroom communication have made efforts to facilitate the transmission of communication research from scholarly journals to elementary and secondary classrooms. Due to their efforts, a wide variety of university courses are being developed which deal in depth with aspects of classroom communication which were formerly treated only superficially, if at all.

As more and more courses have cropped up, questions about them have multiplied. What specific communication competencies do all teachers need? What kinds of information about communication should teachers at different grade levels be aware of? Does such instruction make a difference in teachers' subsequent behavior? What

kinds of classroom instruction in communication can be covered effectively during preservice training, and what kinds are more salient for inservice training? Does on-site training cause greater improvements in a teacher's classroom communication than on-campus training? What problems should be anticipated in conducting interdisciplinary research involving the fields of speech communication and education? What resources are available for developing such courses? Are consultants or financing available to get such courses underway?

Although only partial responses to these questions are currently available, it is the purpose of this report to explore the extent to which answers have been found. This state-of-the-art guide is intended to provide a basis for identifying research priorities and, at the same time, to assist others in their efforts to create and develop additional courses.

1

A Rationale for the Development of Courses in Classroom Communication

A Rationale from the Field of Education

In recent years, an increasing number of educators appear to be awakening to the importance of including study of "human communication" in teacher-training curricula. Contemporary educational literature generally acknowledges that the essence of teaching is communication. Educational theorists recognize that speaking and listening are fundamental to classroom interaction, that teaching involves a spontaneous element of communication between teacher and student, and that the teacher and student are linked in a system of reciprocal communication.[1] This sharpened awareness has opened the way for an expansion of communication studies in schools and departments of education. Ironically, many educators do not yet appear to recognize that the academic field of speech communication can measurably contribute to such study. It is therefore worth examining the following points of similar interest in education and speech communication which could invite dialogue:

1. the possibility and usefulness of rhetorical analysis of the teaching process;
2. the teacher's interpersonal communication needs;
3. the entire spectrum of variables which moderate a teacher's influence upon students, leading to the development of models for analysis of teacher-student interaction which parallel or are closely aligned to models of communication systems;
4. the systematic research of teacher-student classroom communication on an interdisciplinary basis, based on the similarities which exist between communication models and educational models of teacher-student interaction.

4

The Classroom as a Rhetorical Situation

For the most part, educators continue to hold to the traditional view that communication between teacher and students is essentially persuasive, or intentionally influential in nature. Underlying this perspective is a presumption of the teacher's dominance and ability to influence classroom outcomes. This perspective has led to a widely held theoretical view that the classroom constitutes an oral communication situation through which the student is influenced—whether favorably or unfavorably—through the teacher's control or manipulation of the situation.[2] As a consequence, the emphasis of much of the educational research conducted to date has focused primarily upon the teacher and upon the message-sending skills of the teacher. Recognizing the similarities between this perspective and that of traditional rhetorical theory (which likewise emphasizes the means by which a message-sender can influence a receiver-audience), educational scholars have begun to explore rhetorical theory to determine its applicability to the classroom situation. Reflecting this line of thought in contemporary education, Lindley (1971) has written:

> Both rhetoric and teaching serve to reveal, to discover. Both are processes of analysis. Both recognize the complexity of what is to be analyzed and the necessity for that analysis. Above all, both are designed to lead to understanding through techniques of analysis.
>
> The fundamental contribution of rhetorical theory in general to the analysis of teaching process is that such theory indicates that teaching is in fact susceptible to rational analysis. Thus, it may be concluded that teaching is not a randomly assorted and accidental series of events but, rather, has recognizable patterns and structures which inform it.[3]

The Interpersonal Communication Needs of Teachers

In addition to conceiving of the teacher as an influential message-sender, educators have demonstrated over the past decade an increasing awareness of the importance of interpersonal communication skills in teaching. For example, as early as 1963, Smith argued that it was more important to know how to interact with students than to know how to handle the subject matter of instruction.[5] Kimball Wiles (1966), former dean of the University of Florida's College of Education, strongly urged that courses in human communication supplant existing courses in "foundations of education," arguing that it was much more basic to a teacher's preparation to have an "understanding of communication, human relations, group development, intergroup interaction, leadership, community power structure, and personality dynamics."[6] In 1970, Borke and Burstyn urged that interpersonal skills be included among required teacher competencies, explaining that understanding "means more than merely being nice to a student. It

entails mastering skills in interpersonal behavior that should be available to prospective teachers as soon as they begin classroom teaching. . . ."[7] In 1971, Webb concurred,

> The way a teacher behaves, not what he knows, may be the most important issue in the transmission of the teaching-learning exchanges. The psychological behavior, the quality of how the teacher relates to the child, is perhaps the most important basis for the learning attitude held by the child.[8]

Following a similar line of thought, Gazda (1973) argued that the teacher must "have a well-developed repertory of interpersonal skills through which he can establish, maintain and promote effective interpersonal relationships in the classroom."[9]

In brief, today's trainers of teachers appear to be concerned about the need to develop teachers' competencies in areas which, essentially, depend upon knowledge of speech communication: verbal interaction,[10] listening and responding,[11] methods of inquiry,[12] classroom dynamics,[13] interpersonal communication,[14] cross-cultural communication,[15] nonverbal communication,[16] semantics,[17] and the evaluative nature of language.[18] This awareness of professional communication needs has also developed among education students. In 1973, the Student National Education Association (SNEA) adopted a committee report on "essential criteria" dealing with SNEA-perceived needs in schools of education throughout the country. The proposals suggested an integration of concerns for "human relations" throughout preparatory programs and specialized courses in such areas as sensitivity, interpersonal communications, group dynamics, ethnic cultures, and sexism.[19]

The Classroom as a Communication System

Most recently, some educational researchers have begun to recognize that, while there is value in examining the natures of both teacher influence and interpersonal process in teaching, such concerns should be viewed as component portions of the total classroom interactive process.[20] As a consequence, a broader view of the teacher-student relationship has emerged, encompassing an entire host of variables influencing such interaction:

1. the physical, psychological, sociological, and cultural factors influencing each communicator,
2. environmental factors (e.g., time of day, weather),
3. interactional processes.

To obtain a comprehensive picture of what happens in classrooms, this movement in educational research has developed models, making it possible to categorize and organize the extensive quantities of

research information. In at least some cases, these models correspond roughly to communication models already in use, giving cause to believe that semantic and conceptual differences, which have obstructed interdisciplinary work in the past, may yet be surmountable. Important differences still exist, however, since concepts which have become firmly established in communication theory are not yet part of educational theory regarding what happens in classrooms, and vice versa. For purposes of organizing the education and speech communication research reported in this chapter, an educational model (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974) was chosen which deserves examination by speech communication model-developers for its strengths as well as its weaknesses.[21] Using terminology proposed by Mitzel (1960), Dunkin and Biddle suggested that research on classroom processes be categorized as follows:

1. *presage variables*: those characteristics of teachers affecting the teaching process, such as formative experiences, teacher-training experiences, demographic variables (e.g., age, race, sex), and personality characteristics (e.g., warmth, authoritarianism);
2. *context variables*: those characteristics of the environment to which the teacher must adjust, including:
   a. characteristics of pupils (e.g., demographic variables, formative experiences, language, appearance, interactive characteristics, abilities, etc.),
   b. characteristics of the school and community (e.g., ethnic composition of community, size of school),
   c. classroom context (e.g., room size, layout, noise, equipment);
3. *process variables*:
   a. the teacher's classroom behavior,
   b. students' classroom behavior,
   c. teacher-student interaction,
   d. the relationship between teaching activities and classroom events;
4. *product variables*: immediate and/or long-term changes occurring in students as a result of their classroom involvement.

Additionally, Dunkin and Biddle suggest that relationships between these four variables might be categorized into classes of knowledge, such as:

5. the relationship between context and process variables in teaching,
6. the relationship between presage conditions and teaching processes,
7. relationships among processes occurring in the classroom (how

the teacher's and students' behaviors co-vary and influence one another in the classroom).
8. relationships between the processes and products of teaching.

While this model will be used as a guide, the reports of research which follow focus only upon process variables and the interrelationships among process and presage, context, and product variables, since these areas are of greatest interest to researchers in classroom communication.

Research on Classroom Communication from the Field of Education

The field of education has produced a vast amount of research on elements affecting communication in the classroom. Until recently, however, little effort had been made to organize these extensive findings in ways that were helpful to the researcher in communication. In 1974, Brophy and Good's *Teacher-Student Relationships* provided a major breakthrough for the researcher in classroom communication by offering an overview of existing educational research on the causes and consequences of teacher-student relationships.[22] Brophy and Good grouped together research regarding such areas as individual differences in teacher-student interaction patterns, the influences of teachers' attitudes toward students on classroom behavior, and the influences of the sex of the teacher and student on classroom behavior. Because sources such as Brophy and Good are available, the literature review which follows will serve only as a cursory guide to some of the major directions underway in educational research.

Research on Process Variables

The primary focus of educational research dealing with process variables in the classroom has been measurable verbal behaviors rather than nonverbal behaviors.[23] Research on the teacher's classroom behavior by the Central Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL, 1968) uncovered (1) the tendency of teachers to ask a high proportion of questions eliciting students' memory processes rather than more sophisticated thought processes; and (2) evidence that teachers gave incorrect answers to student questions 15 percent of the time, "a statistic which may do much to explain the scarcity of pupil questions."[24] Subsequent research into students' classroom behavior by CEMREL (1969) revealed that what student talk there is in a classroom is unevenly distributed, with some students interacting with the teacher as infrequently as 5 or 6 times in ten classroom hours, others interacting as frequently as 50, 80, or more than 120 times during the same period.[25]

The method most widely known and used by educational researchers for obtaining information on teacher-student interaction has been interaction analysis (IA), an observational system developed by Ned Flanders (1970).[26] Despite the limitations of IA,[27] educators have generated a considerable volume of research, using either Flanders' model or one of a variety of alternative observational systems, modifications, for the most part, of the initial tool developed by Flanders. The quantity of research findings is far too great to consider in depth here, making it necessary to indicate the direction of this particular research with an example. Extensive research by Flanders and Bellack (1965)[28] confirmed that, for better or worse, teachers do about two-thirds to three-quarters of the talking in the classroom, the predominant pattern of communication being a question asked by the teacher, a response from a pupil, and some kind of reaction from the teacher as to what the pupil has replied. This is a pattern of communication that apparently has remained unchanged in instruction since at least the early 1900s.[29]

The basic data collected in research on process variables may not appear challenging to all researchers in the field of classroom communication. The resulting conclusions, however, may bear significant implications for teacher-training programs. Despite the limited scope of present research identifying and describing elements involved in classroom communication, this kind of research already provides teacher educators with bases for formulating specific behavioral objectives and suggests ways for teachers to function more effectively in specific verbal exchanges.

Research on Interrelationships among Variables

As data has gradually accumulated over the past decade, it has become possible to examine the relationships among presage, context, process, and product variables with greater specificity. Early attitudinal research by Davidson and Lang (1960) demonstrated that children infer teachers' attitudes toward them from the teachers' behaviors and that there is an apparent relationship between teachers' communication of negative attitudes and low student achievement.[30] Several years later, Devault, et al. (1967) reported a study indicating that the teacher's communicative behavior also has a clear influence upon students' concepts of self and attitudes toward school. The authors concluded, "Apparently, teachers need to be made increasingly aware of the impact which this personal element in teaching has on the learner."[31] In 1969, Good and Brophy reviewed some of the most significant research to date on intraclassroom differences in teacher-child interaction patterns and concluded that "children differing in social status, sex, or achievement level regularly differ in the type of

interaction they have with their teacher."[32] A follow-up experiment by Good and Brophy (1972), replicating and extending research by Silberman (1969),[33] Spaulding confirmed that the attitudes teachers hold toward students do influence the quality and quantity of contacts they have with those students.[34] Most recently, research by Hess and Takanishi at Stanford University (1974) examined a particularly wide assortment of variables which could influence a student's "engagement" (voluntary interest, attention) in a class: student characteristics (low income, ethnicity, sex, grade level), contextual variables (subject matter, changed architectural conditions, and weather), and differences among teachers. Confirming the findings of earlier research, the results indicated that differences between teachers accounted for the largest percentage of variation in students' engagement and that the teachers' attitudes explained much of the variance.[35]

Thus there are strong indications that it is the teacher and the presage variables concerning the teacher which determine the climate and patterns of communication for a classroom. As a consequence, interrelational research has begun to focus attention more intently upon the teachers' interactions as they vary in relations with one individual student and another. Variational factors of particular interest at this time include:

1. the effect of the teacher's expectations and attitudes upon dyadic teacher-student interaction;
2. the effect of students' grade level, age, race, sex, name, socio-economic status, achievement potential, or drive upon teacher interaction;
3. the effect of students' attractiveness (personality as well as appearance) upon teacher interaction;
4. the effect of seating location upon teacher interaction;
5. the effect of writing neatness upon teacher interaction;
6. the effect of the student's facility in using standard English upon teacher interaction.[36]

Research from all directions is pointing to the teacher's attitudes and resulting interactional behavior as the keys to the communication patterns occurring in classrooms. This is a finding which cannot help but influence the future planning of teacher training at both the preservice and inservice levels. Whether or not this planning will reflect interdisciplinary input from the fields of both education and speech communication will strongly depend upon the willingness of teacher trainers to accept and use the contributions of both branches of study. Teacher educator R. G. Martin (1971) has called for his colleagues to be humble: "It is time to admit that in theories of teaching, as in teacher training, we are still whistling in the dark." Pointing out that most of the advances since 1960 in defining and recognizing good

teaching have only "nibbled at the edges of a greater problem, the nature of human communication." Martin has argued, "if teaching implies communication, then we cannot ignore the latter and expect a realistic account of the former."[17] If teacher education is to benefit from current knowledge of communication, educational professionals will first need to recognize the potential rewards of interdisciplinary cooperation with professional students of speech communication. The time is ripe for such sharing. The volume of relevant research from diverse fields is growing annually, and interdisciplinary efforts clearly are needed to synthesize what is known in order to reconstitute a viable, holistic theory of communication in the classroom.

A Rationale from the Field of Speech Communication

It is important for planners of interdisciplinary projects to recognize that there is a difference of perspective between students of speech communication and professionals in the field of education regarding training in communication for teachers. Historically, professionals in speech communication have been concerned with several levels of teacher training:

1. training all teachers (K-12) to be more effective communicators themselves;
2. training all teachers (K-12) to develop elementary skills in speech communication in all their students (e.g., how to present oral ideas coherently and clearly, how to work productively in groups, how to give oral reports and presentations, how to ask questions and to respond appropriately, how to conduct meetings, how to think critically and evaluate orally);
3. training all elementary teachers to recognize and refer speech and hearing disorders to other specialists;
4. training prospective speech communication teachers for teaching specialized or advanced skills through organized courses in speech communication.

While the field of education has recently come to focus upon the first of these levels,[18] professionals in speech communication have long maintained the position that all teachers need instruction in both the first two levels, to improve their own basic competencies, and to improve their abilities to develop and maintain at least a minimum standard of competency among their students.

For many years, it has been clear to instructors of basic college courses in speech communication that only a few entering students are prepared to deal with a college-level communication course. The vast majority of entering students (even at the most select colleges) require intensive work if they are to develop basic speaking, listening, and

interacting skills which should have been developed in their earlier schooling.[39] Recently, the rapid spread of open-enrollment at public institutions has exposed the true magnitude of this problem, revealing to all educators how severely ill-prepared today's high school graduates are in such elementary skills as orally expressing their ideas with coherence and clarity or understanding and rationally analyzing the ideas they hear. Even more disturbing is the fact that large numbers of these same students intend to become teachers.

For many years, speech communication educators have argued that students' basic communicative abilities could not be improved until the communicative competencies of all teachers improved. Thus, while the profession still steadfastly maintains that schools have a responsibility to provide students with organized speaking and listening instruction to extend minimal skills (offered by qualified speech communication faculty),[40] there is the concurrent belief that improved communication instruction for all teachers cannot help but be reflected in their students.

Speech Communication Instruction for Teachers

Speech communication educators today maintain that teachers' foundation instruction should include at least basic concepts of the sending and receiving processes of communication. This is part of a theoretical framework needed to introduce the teacher to the interrelationships among elements of communication. Basic message-sending skills which all teachers might learn include:

1. analyzing students to determine initial guidelines for message construction—most suitable presentation channels, most engaging delivery techniques, etc.;
2. selecting, organizing, supporting, and clearly expressing ideas in a verbal and nonverbal manner appropriate to the students, e. g., giving directions, lecturing, explaining, questioning, stimulating discussion;
3. exercising a variety of ways to solicit feedback, express approval or disapproval, or criticize or evaluate student communication.

Basic message-receiving skills which all teachers might learn include:

1. identifying central ideas and supporting arguments,
2. weighing evidence and logical validity,
3. listening for different levels of meaning in messages,
4. listening and responding with empathic sensitivity,
5. interpreting nonverbal messages.

Assuming that these skills have been learned within a framework of communication theory, experts in speech communication further

recommend that classroom teachers be exposed to supplemental theoretical knowledge which specially applies to classroom communication, emphasizing:

1. the transactional nature and the reciprocal process of communication in the classroom;[41]
2. the nature of interpersonal communication;[42]
3. selective processes limiting perception;[43]
4. the effect of special psychological processes upon sending and receiving behaviors, such as self-concept, personality, culturally determined biases and perceptions, dogmatism, stereotyping, attitudes, values, and expectations;[44]
5. bases of nonverbal communication in the classroom (derived from kinesics, eye behavior, paralinguistics, proxemics, haptics, etc.);[45]
6. principles of semantics stressing the evaluative and perceptually reflective nature of language;[46]
7. the significance for the classroom of new knowledge in sociolinguistics, particularly regarding the effect of nonstandard dialects upon classroom interactions;[47]
8. the non-linguistic socioeconomic and cultural/subcultural variables affecting a student's communicative efforts;[48]
9. other elements of interpersonal communication affecting classroom communication (e.g., the effect of defensiveness, ways to build trust, communication nets, etc.);[49]
10. theory of group processes: group dynamics, discussion, leadership, problem solving;[50]
11. basic principles of recognizing a wide range of communication-deviant behaviors, both pathological and psychological in origin, which may be manifested through students' communication;[51]
12. basic principles of diagnosing the development of oral language in each student in order to establish goals and to determine individual progress;[52]
13. concepts of the function of communication essential to a teacher's ability to develop the skills of the student as both a sender and receiver of messages at all educational levels, including (but not limited to) students' skills in:
    a. creative self-expression,
    b. task-oriented dyadic and group interactions,
    c. discussion methods to resolve problems and explore issues,
    d. interpersonal communication,
    e. leadership,
    f. conflict resolution.[53]

Other sources have amply documented the history of the profession's arguments favoring the foregoing kinds of instruction.[54] This

report will therefore only review the most recent speech communication writing regarding teachers' needs for instruction in communication.

Recent Position Statements and Recommendations

Since the various advocates from the speech communication profession have, in general, built their arguments upon previously established position statements, it is helpful to consider these positions in chronological sequence, from 1968 to the present. This will provide an overview of the escalating concerns and involvement of speech communication educators.

In 1968, an article by Phillips (Pennsylvania State University) epitomized much of the profession's frustration over the extent to which both students and teachers were being deprived of adequate instruction in communication:

> Schools, to date, have made little effort to provide training in oral communication through the grades. Such training as is offered comes sporadically, almost as an afterthought. In the elementary curriculum, it is apparently assumed that children can speak and nothing need be done about it unless they display one of the known pathologies that can be treated by a speech correctionist. In the secondary school, oral communication training called "speech" is directed toward a special interest program for exceptionally talented students. The elective public speaking course, the debate team, and the drama group normally draw a student who is not intimidated by self-exposure and who may even have a prurient drive toward self-exposure. There is little evidence of a coordinate effort to provide oral communication training across the grades designed to help students meet both their communication needs imposed by the curriculum and those that they feel on the outside. Requiring a student to recite in class or present a report presumes the ability to do so, yet nowhere in the curriculum is the child trained in technique or given the emotional strength to guarantee that he can cope with the assignment. . . . Students cannot communicate well with each other, let alone with the authority figures they encounter, and the school does nothing about this either.
>
> Apparently the schools are not sensitive to the oral communication needs of their students. It is tacitly assumed that every child will develop capability on his own and without formal training.[5]

Arguing that success in education and in later employment strongly depends upon skill in communication, Phillips maintained that communication training must take place in the regular curriculum and that all teachers should be trained in the teaching of oral communication so that they will be capable of teaching children specific skills. In a brief report of federally funded experimental communication programs for non-speech teachers (under Title III grants in Pennsyl-

vania and California). Phillips presented the outcome of four years' work to develop "communication-centered classrooms," reported that the programs had been evaluated as "highly effective," and offered some suggestions based on the outcomes of these programs.[56]

Addressing concerns similar to those voiced by Phillips, the Speech Association of America's[57] (SAA) New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development (1968) issued four recommendations affecting the clarification of communication content which non-speech teachers might be able to teach and the availability of speech communication courses to non-speech teachers. Specifically, Conference participants recommended:

1. that scholars "develop a systematically articulated program of speech communication instruction extending from the preschool experience through the graduate program which reflects findings derived from speech communication theory and research";[58]
2. that academic departments of speech "make speech communication courses available to interested students in all areas of study";
3. that academic departments of speech "provide a course focusing on the instructional communication process for all prospective teachers";
4. that the SAA "arrange a continuing series of conferences designed to bring together speech communication researchers and other scholar-educators in the field" for the purposes of:
   a. developing research programs in speech communication for the elementary and secondary levels,
   b. revising existing curricula and instruction on the basis of empirical research in speech communication.[59]

By 1970, speech communication educators were devoting a considerable amount of attention to the communication needs of teachers, K-12. In that year, two separate conferences of the Speech Communication Association (SCA) issued major recommendations regarding communication instruction for teachers. At the National Conference on Rhetoric, the Committee on the Scope of Rhetoric and the Place of Rhetorical Studies in Higher Education specified that teachers in all subject areas were responsible not only for teaching the specific content of their area, but also for understanding, controlling, and improving their own communication in the classroom, and for increasing their students' awareness of the processes of human symbolic interaction.[60] In particular, this committee recognized K-12 teachers' special needs for rhetorical study:

> Recognizing that habits of communication and attitudes toward language, toward symbols, and toward communication are often well

established in the student by the time he enters college, the conferees recommend increasing attention to the teaching of communication and rhetoric—broadly and flexibly construed—in elementary and secondary schools, and they further recommend that more training in the use of language and other symbols, and in communication, be offered to prospective secondary and elementary teachers.[61]

The following suggestions appeared in conference papers published after the second SCA conference that year, "On Implications of Recent Research for Speech Communication Education."

1. Teachers K-12 should be taught that, as a general rule, it is more important to say something than to say something well, or beautifully, or eloquently.[62]
2. Teachers K-12 should have competency in and be able to teach children basic rhetoric ("the rendering of discourse [the rational use of ordinary language] systematic and manageable").[63]
3. Speech communication for children should not be treated as a separate area of the curriculum. Since it is recognized that communication skills are necessary for mastery in all subjects, instruction in communication skills should be integrated with the total curriculum.[64]
4. Teacher trainers need to rethink the old "teacher-is-a-speech-model" notion. They should, instead, be training teachers to model a far broader range of speech communication behaviors, such as reinforcement of student-initiated responses, recognition and acceptance of affect statements, statements of praise and encouragement of student ideas, use of student ideas in determining instructional strategies, asking questions that call for elaborated responses, and use of feedback in classroom planning.[65]
5. Current research findings on children's communication development need to be transmitted to elementary classroom teachers—research, for instance, on phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, paralanguage, and kinesics.[66]
6. Elementary teachers should be taught to differentiate deficiencies from differences in communication.[67]
7. Teachers K-12 should be taught three basic communication tenets: (a) the purpose of communication is to affect receivers rather than to construct messages alone, (b) meanings are in people, not in words, and (c) reality is a matter of subjective perceptions rather than an objective concept.[68]
8. From grade two to grade six, teachers should be prepared to help students express tentative judgments and alternatives and to use the expanded code. Junior high school teachers should be prepared to assist the student's paralinguistic expression of role, mood, and meaning.[69]

9. Very little is known about the relationship between speech development and reading readiness. Research is needed to determine what dialect features a child needs to acquire orally prior to learning to read.[70]
10. Oracy should be taught not only in ways that increase verbal ability, but also in ways that increase the child's joy in communicating and broaden his perception of the total process.[71]
11. The dominant goal of K-12 education is the development of individuals who can communicate as readily and as appropriately as their education and talent permit. The product of our schools should have the opportunity to develop their most human function—communication—in order to achieve an integration of private self and public self.[72]

Following the two 1970 conferences, efforts were made to determine the best methods for meeting the needs which had been identified. In 1972, participants at the SCA Airlie Conference recommended immediate production of an instructional development package for "speech communication training for all teachers at all levels of education, directed toward insuring speech competency as a requirement of teachers at all levels."[73] At the follow-up to the Airlie Conference, the summer 1973 SCA Conference on Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication, conference participants passed recommendations urging:

1. SCA members to identify general areas of competence applicable to all teachers, as well as competencies unique to speech communication teachers;[74]
2. the SCA to support the position that "all teachers (K-12) should receive practical communication instruction in schools of communication primarily through courses from the interdisciplinary curriculum which might also include the course in 'Communication for Teachers'";[75]
3. the SCA to "actively pursue interdisciplinary coordination with professional associations in the language arts for the purpose of identifying a core requirement recommended as common for teacher preparation models for all subject areas within the communication rubric";[76]
4. interdisciplinary cooperation in the development of competency-based teacher-education (CBTE) programs including the specification of competencies which speech communication teachers are uniquely qualified to develop.[77]
5. the development of a promotional campaign for the speech communication field directed to school principals, guidance counselors, certification committees, and members of state departments of education.[78]

Efforts to Ensure Speech Communication Competency in All Teachers

In August 1973, at the SCA Memphis Conference for Teacher Educators, the caucus studying teacher certification urged the SCA Educational Policies Board to initiate an official position statement calling for "demonstrated competencies in speech communication for all teachers at all instructional levels."[79] Other official recommendations, to be implemented through the Educational Policies Board and the Research Board, included the encouragement of research on all components of the teacher education process as well as on the interrelationships among those components,[80] and the establishment of procedures for identifying the speech communication competencies needed by all teachers.[81]

Since the Memphis Conference, speech communication scholars have reported some hopeful developments. In an appendage to the 1974 published report of the Memphis Conference, Ecroyd pointed out that "many" new state certification requirements for teachers are showing concern for the development of speech communication skills in both teachers and their students by requiring such competencies as:

1. "The teacher will have the ability to define and use communication as a human transaction; the teacher also will have the ability to structure oral communication classroom activities which further the growth of student interpersonal skills.
2. "The teacher will have the ability to communicate easily with people of various social, regional, and ethnic dialects; the teacher also will have the ability to structure classroom activities which will encourage linguistic diversity.
3. "The teacher will have the ability to make clear and comprehensible statements and to demonstrate them through the effective presentation of evidence; the teacher also will have the ability to structure classroom activities which will stimulate logical reasoning and problem solving as alternatives to emotional confrontation or violence.
4. "The teacher will have the ability to use language in such a way that it unites and integrates listeners rather than polarizing them; the teacher also will have the ability to structure classroom activities which expand the use of precise and vivid language by students."[82]

The 1975 Conference on Intercultural Communication and Teacher Education provided speech communication and education specialists with an opportunity to meet and explore the potential of interdisciplinary exchange in one important area of classroom communication. Using the term *intercultural communication* as a more precise

descriptor than *human relations*, speech communication scholar and conference planner Jain argued that teachers "need to be trained to become effective in intercultural communication with their own students as well as to facilitate effective intercultural communication among students and other units of the educational institution."[83] Among the competencies which Jain suggested for inclusion in general teacher-education curricula are the following:

1. knowledge dealing with the impact of cultural traits (such as assumptions, customs, beliefs, social institutions, norms, values, verbal and nonverbal behavior patterns and attitudes shared by members of a particular culture) upon the communication process (perception, verbal and nonverbal behavior patterns, response, meaning, feedback, metacommunication, and other subprocesses of communication);
2. knowledge of ethnocentrism, racism, prejudice, discrimination, stereotypes, categorization process and other intergroup communication concepts, and knowledge of their manifestations and effects on intercultural communication between teachers and students, among students, among teachers, and between teachers and parents; and
3. the ability to establish supportive communication with students of different cultural backgrounds both within and outside the classroom.[84]

Finally, during 1975, the SCA and the American Theatre Association jointly recommended guidelines for the preparation of speech communication and theater teachers to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. These guidelines additionally offer an initial summary of the associations' joint recommendations on the kinds of communication instruction which should be included in all teacher education programs.[85]

Research on Classroom Communication from the Field of Speech Communication

The speech communication profession has given particular emphasis to the development of instructional means to improve communication skills and understanding. Speech communication educators have published a variety of textbooks written to meet the communication needs of all classroom teachers.[86] Summaries of speech communication research pertinent to the classroom experience appear in a variety of works, including (in chronological order) the Anderson and Lynn dissertations, the 1970 and 1973 SCA Summer Conference Reports, as well as the Report of the Memphis Conference of Teacher Educators.[87] The following discussion of research since

1973 is therefore intended only as a supplement to what is already available. Dunkin and Biddle's categories are used to provide a structure parallel to that used above.

Context Variables and Relationships between Context and Processes

While educational researchers may view characteristics of the pupil, the classroom, the school, and the community as all being part of the teacher's context, contemporary speech communication theorists assume an interdependent relationship between teacher and students. Such theory views a teacher and students as mutually affecting classroom interactions and mutually conditioning communication outcomes. As a consequence, speech communication theory argues that:

1. to a great extent, parallel information regarding teachers and students should be gathered, since students' perceptions, attitudes, formative experiences, etc., are as much factors in determining teacher-student interaction as are those of the teacher;
2. because both teachers and students are, in fact, mutually responsible for the interaction occurring in a classroom, both need to develop communication skills and understanding to help them interact effectively.

Illustrating this interdependent view of teacher-student interaction is Haslett's ongoing research on the way in which students' perceptions of teachers influence their relationship. Among other findings, Haslett's research has identified (1) judgmental dimensions used by high school students in evaluating teachers,[88] (2) a significant correlation between a student's interpersonal effectiveness and that student's attitudes toward teachers,[89] (3) evidence that low ability students hold significantly less positive attitudes toward teachers,[90] and (4) evidence that female students have more positive attitudes toward teachers than do male students.[91]

Interrelational Studies: Process-Context-Product

In general, as speech communication researchers have explored interrelationships among classroom variables, they have done so from perspectives that are communication oriented. For example, in a study relating process and product variables, speech communication scholars Munn and Giffin (1973) indicated that students' satisfaction in a beginning college course is highest when an instructor exhibits both high task behaviors (sharing knowledge, clarifying concepts, answering questions, summarizing, and evaluating the student's progress), as well as high maintenance behavior (warmth, friendliness, cooperation, mutual trust, and respect).[92]

Speech communication research has expanded in the direction of observational research on teacher-student interaction (e.g., Gibson and Kline, 1973;[93] Miller and Hylton, 1974[94]). A study by Roberts and Becker is of particular interest since it considered high school vocational education classrooms and workshops throughout the State of Florida which involved highly unstructured, informal teacher-student interactions.[95] The results clearly showed the importance of communication skills in the teaching-learning process. The investigators found that students gave high evaluation ratings to teachers who gave significantly more positive reinforcement and who expressed significantly more favorable attitudes toward their students. Supervisors gave high ratings to teachers who used significantly better delivery skills, more eye contact, more skillful gestures, and who spent significantly more time in direct contact with their students. Overall, the "best" teachers were characterized as being very dynamic (having enthusiasm, self-confidence, organizational ability), as having superior delivery skills, as spending a great amount of time in direct contact with students, as maintaining a positive attitude toward students, and as creating a pleasant social environment through the use of positive reinforcement and banter.

Applications of Speech Communication Research to the Classroom Situation

Overall, there is much in the existing body of speech communication research which is relevant to classroom communication but which has not yet been applied to the classroom situation. Speech communication researchers have, for instance, made major breakthroughs in understanding reticence—a significant problem in grades K-12.[96] Research by McGlone and Anderson (1973) and by McCroskey, Holdridge, and Toomb (1974) has applied existing knowledge about speaker credibility in order to learn more about students' perceptions of teacher credibility and about the stability of these perceptions over the course of a school term.[97] Current research on types of oral criticisms also holds great promise for teacher training.[98] Along with other studies weighing the impact of dialect upon communication interactions, research is growing on teachers' perceptions of dialectal differences.[99] And, recent research by Boileau (1974) has combined knowledge about persuasion with theories of child development in an exploration of how children's responses to persuasive speech conform to Piaget's developmental theory.[100]

Additional contributions can be made by applying speech communication theory to the classroom. Teachers and teacher educators need to be made aware, for example, that communication occurs in integrated systems and patterns of behavior. They need to be made aware that if a communication skill is taught without incorporating it

into an individual's existing verbal-nonverbal communication patterns, the outcome commonly is communication behavior which is exaggerated, disproportionate, and/or inconsistent. In essence, there is unlimited opportunity for speech communication researchers to apply existing knowledge in order to acquire a more precise understanding of what characterizes communication situations in K-12 non-speech classrooms.

To summarize briefly, within the past decade, scholars studying speech communication have grown highly vocal in their insistence that instruction in communication be expanded to a significant degree in teacher education. Their arguments have been directed toward the unmet needs of both teachers and students. Conference papers and other published writings offer abundant suggestions for meeting these needs. As an increasing number of speech communication researchers have become involved in studying the processes of classroom communication, there has been an increased sharing of information about classroom communication within the field. Convention programs are regularly including offerings dealing with research and instruction in classroom communication, and speech communication publications are reporting on the successful experiences of colleges offering off-campus courses to teachers in the theory and skills of classroom communication.[101]

As certification requirements undergo change, it seems reasonable to anticipate increased pressure from speech communication educators to share in the process of defining the communicative competencies needed by all teachers. In short, speech communication scholars are engaged in a major interdisciplinary thrust: to reach out of their own departments and into the field of education in order to share knowledge of speech communication with educators, to strengthen the speech communication backgrounds of both prospective and practicing teachers in all disciplines, and to prepare specialists in speech communication to consult in school systems.

Obstacles to Course Development and Countering Conditions

The recent growth of courses in classroom communication has occurred despite a number of obstacles. First, several conditions peculiar to the field of education have sharply restricted expansion of any kind in teacher-training programs.

a. Because most preservice programs for teachers are already overloaded with required course work, even the most desirable electives often attract too few enrollees to justify continued support as courses for education majors only.
b. As a consequence of the rapid shift from a shortage of teachers to a surplus of teachers in the nation, existing teacher-training

programs are commonly overstaffed, and few, if any, faculty lines exist for adding specialists in speech communication.

c. Most schools of education are currently operating on reduced budgets and cannot consider the additional expenses which might stem from expanded programs.

Secondly, negative attitudes among educational professionals toward speech communication as an academic field have in the past interfered with productive interdisciplinary collaboration in teacher education.

a. Almost since the beginnings of the academic study of speech communication, non-speech educators have resisted recognizing speech communication as a true academic subject. These negative attitudes appear to have persisted over the past ten years, despite the growing recognition among educators that teachers need special study of communication. In 1967, the president of the Speech Communication Association charged that the attitudes of educational administrators prevented the recognition of speech communication as an academic subject as respectable as psychology or philosophy.[102] By 1975, little change had been observed. The associate executive secretary for education of the SCA reported late in that year that "the attitude toward speech as a 'frill' in the English offerings (to be taught by anyone who has ever had a speech course) still persists." Indicating the pervasiveness of these negative attitudes, the secretary revealed that the National Institute of Education does not support speaking and listening research "because Senate appropriations committees simply do not understand what it is we are trying to teach."[103]

b. By model, if not always by dictum, educators have commonly operated as if believing that once children can talk, no further training in communication is needed other than the development of reading and writing skills. In actual educational practice, language arts programs in elementary education have focused for decades almost exclusively upon the development of skills in reading and writing.[104]

c. Similarly, educators have traditionally assumed that if a teacher can talk, no special training in communication is required other than training in reading and writing. As a consequence, more than half of the secondary speech communication teachers in the country today have neither an academic major nor a primary teaching interest in speech communication.[105] By hiring and licensing so many unqualified or underqualified teachers to teach speech communication, state certification agencies and educational administrators have significantly contributed to the problem. This fact simply reinforces the attitude that instruction in

speech communication is of dubious value. In even the "strongest" speech communication states, the vast majority of pre-college teachers of speech communication do not begin to meet the professional standards established by the SCA.[106]

Third, limited perceptions of the potential contribution of the speech communication field to education and to teachers' own needs in speech communication have restricted the kinds of courses available to all teachers.

a. For the most part, educational professionals have had little opportunity to become aware of the expanded scope of the speech communication field, its increased synthesizing of multidisciplinary input, and the widened range of its contributions in teacher education.
b. On the other hand, those educational professionals who have seen the potential of instruction in speech communication have occasionally found fault with the few remaining staunchly traditional speech communication departments which have not been responsive to the special needs of classroom teachers. Such needs, teacher educators have argued, are not wholly met in public speaking and/or oral interpretation courses designed for the general college population.

These continuing conditions are causes enough to obstruct the development of any courses in classroom communication. It is therefore worth noting the more positive, apparently countering conditions which seem to be facilitating the growth of such courses. According to the professional literature from both academic fields, changing attitudes appear to be playing a major part in this new development.

1. There appears to be growing recognition in both the speech communication and education professions that teachers have special needs to develop greater understandings and skills in communication.
2. There appears to be a growing belief that the development of teachers' competencies in communication will be reflected in their classrooms—which behavior, in turn, will serve as an important inductive learning model for their students.
3. There appears to be a growing acceptance of a long established premise of speech communication education—that communication skills and awarenesses are not innate and do not appear naturally with aging; they must be learned.
4. There appears to be a growing interdisciplinary body of research directed at the better understanding of interactions in classroom communication.

5. There appears to be growing academic and professional support from both fields for the development of courses in classroom communication, as evidenced by statements from prominent scholars and professional associations.

State Certification Requirements for Teachers

Due to the national move to require specific teaching competencies rather than coursework as the bases for certification, it is currently not possible to determine an accurate nationwide profile of speech communication competencies required for certification of all teachers. At the present time, roughly half the states in the nation are studying competency-based educational requirements for certification. The remaining half have moved beyond that point, either to require CBTE standards for some or all certifications, or to accept CBTE as an alternative to requiring either specific courses and credit hours or graduation from an approved teacher education program.[107] Due to this state of flux, the character of information varies with each source, and it is possible to offer only a tentative report on:

1. speech communication certification requirements in states still specifying course and credit requirements,
2. the arbitrary nature of training in speech communication for teachers in states requiring only graduation from an approved teacher-training program,
3. present inclusion of competencies in speech communication in certification requirements for all teachers, and the extent to which experts on speech communication are consulted in determining those competencies.

Among those states still specifying course and credit requirements for certification, only four states in the nation require teachers to take one course designated as "speech."[108] Two states specify a certification requirement in "oral communication" or "oral English,"[109] and two states require for certification "satisfactory use" or "adequate background" in speech communication.[110] While only these few states require speech communication courses, most of the others which still specify course requirements will accept a limited number of credits in speech communication toward fulfilling an English or general education requirement.

Roughly half the states do not today specify requirements for certification but only require a college degree from an approved teacher-education program.[111] The impetus for requiring instruction in speech communication for teachers rests within each teacher-training program. As a consequence, one approved program may require speech communication of all candidates; a second approved program

may simply recommend such instruction; and a third program might only accept work in speech communication without either requiring or recommending it. As recently as 1970, only nineteen schools accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education required teacher trainees to take a basic course in speech communication designed specifically for teachers.[112]

In light of the minimal standards required at the present time, the move by states to adopt competency or performance-based certification standards may prove welcome to speech communication educators. As educational professionals have attempted to define competencies essential for certification, they have shown increasing agreement that all teachers need competencies in communication skills and understanding. In North Carolina, for example, current state certification requirements specify that elementary and intermediate school teachers must be able to demonstrate such competencies as working relationships for use in developing learning environments, personal attributes and attitudes that promote interaction between teacher and learner, and an understanding of the influence of communication and of the process of learning to listen, speak, read, and write clearly and effectively. Regarding secondary teachers, North Carolina's certification requirements specify that the general education component of a teacher's education should assure that all teachers are able to communicate clearly and effectively, and that a teacher's professional education should provide the skills necessary to maximize positive human and social relationships.[113]

In Minnesota, state certification since 1973 has required completion of a competency-based program designed to develop abilities in "human relations."[114] Similarly, in 1972, Wisconsin's certification requirements added a provision requiring teachers prepared in Wisconsin to go through a specified human relations program.[115] At least two additional states, Illinois and Michigan, are considering the adoption of similar human relations requirements for general teacher certification.

Despite the fact that certification agencies have begun to specify communication competencies for classroom teachers, and despite the fact that for several years speech communication authorities have been working on communication competencies for both teachers and students in K-12, there has been little interdisciplinary interaction in defining such teacher competencies, an oversight with detrimental impact upon the competency delineations. By overlooking the need for interdisciplinary input at important developmental stages, teacher educators have reduced deliberations on teachers' communicative competencies to unnecessarily limited perceptions of knowledge about communication.

In conclusion, it appears at the present time that certification

requirements for communicative knowledge and skills directly related to classrooms vary considerably from state to state. The direction of change is clearly favoring CBTE, but it is also clear that increased interdisciplinary exchange would offer advantages in defining teachers' competencies in communication for certification. State committees at work on such competencies can benefit from a review of the thought and direction which has steadily come from the field of speech communication over the past few decades. Most important, in light of the generally recognized needs of teachers for better understanding of classroom communication, and given the growing pool of highly trained experts in speech communication, there appears to be no reason for states or the federal government to overlook or, worse, to exclude this talent from research and planning relating to teacher education.

Anticipated Governmental Support of Research and Instruction

The speech communication field has received little support from governmental sources either for research or for the development of instructional methods and resources. Any increase in support at this point appears to depend heavily upon improvement in the attitudes of educators, administrators, and legislators toward the study of speech communication. Assuming that current favorable attitudes can be maintained and expanded, researchers in speech communication may gain increased access to federal or state funding to investigate the many questions regarding instruction in communication for both teachers and their students.

Until recently, the field of speech communication has not been represented either in governmental offices connected with education or in committees responsible for general teacher training. Consequently, at the federal level, educational agencies have solicited little input from geographically distant authorities on speech communication. As recently as 1974, educational professionals neglected to solicit the participation of professionals in speech communication in the federally sponsored National Planning Conference on Studies in Teaching (June 1974). This conference was attended by "some 100 respected practitioners, administrators, and researchers."[116] The primary objective of the conference was to provide an agenda for further research and development to guide the National Institute of Education (NIE) in its planning and funding over the next several years.[117] Since the conference was conceived as the first major federal effort to develop a coordinated research effort in the social sciences, it was discouraging that no representative of speech communication as a field was invited to participate, even on panels which obviously dealt with speech communication. Many of this conference's recommenda-

tions for federally funded research relate directly to the interests of specialists in speech communication, and it is hoped that proposals relating to speech communication will receive major consideration in future NIE funding. The following brief synopsis covers some of the major research suggestions.

The panel on "Teaching as Human Interaction" perceived three essential research needs:

1. the need to create knowledge about and an understanding of the process of teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction during teaching and learning,
2. the need to create knowledge and methods to improve teacher education for teaching as human interaction,
3. the need to improve methodology and instrumentation for doing research on teaching as human interaction, as well as the methods of communicating that research to educational practitioners.

As a consequence of this panel's work, five programs were designated as high priority research concerns worthy of federal review for funding in the near future:

1. patterns of teacher-pupil interaction;
2. relationships among interaction processes, variables of context and setting, and characteristics of pupils;
3. relationships among teacher variables, interaction processes, and pupils' perceptions of these processes;
4. the relationship between teacher-pupil interaction and the effects of the interaction on pupils;
5. research on the determinants of teaching, interaction processes, and the effects of teaching.[118]

The panel on "Teaching as a Linguistic Process in a Cultural Setting" identified basic research needs for federal funding which closely coincide with the research interests of scholars in speech communication:

1. the need for basic research on ways of describing classroom talk;
2. the need to explore "a virtually untouched area: how children learn to talk appropriately in school";
3. the need to investigate specific aspects of cultural differences in the use of language;
4. the need to explore inequalities in encounters between teachers and children (i.e., where differing perceptions, value systems, expectations, etc. affect the interaction);
5. the need to investigate interaction in bilingual classrooms.[119]

Though professional students of speech communication were not invited to this major planning conference, they may find encourage-

ment in the fact that the conference acknowledged the immediate need for research on processes of classroom communication. There are an ample number of specialists in speech communication who are qualified to conduct such research. Some have already begun this task. They and others ought to submit proposals falling within the broad planning directions established by the conference. The door to federal support has barely been cracked, but if researchers are swift, they should be able to wedge a foot in that crack.

2

Current Status of Courses and Programs in Classroom Communication

Since educators appear to agree that the classroom constitutes a rhetorical context, and since they appear to recognize teachers' special needs for instruction in communication, it seems reasonable to assume that study in the theory and skills of classroom communication would be a major component of preservice and inservice teacher training. The assumption may be reasonable, but the most recent information indicates that this is not the case. The most recent evidence indicates that nationally only nineteen schools accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) may be requiring prospective teachers to take a basic speech communication course designed primarily for teachers,[1] and only 24 percent of the NCATE schools offering graduate education degrees may be offering practicing teachers any kind of elective course in the theory and skills of classroom communication.[2] Admittedly, information on instruction in communication in teacher education is scant, and few conclusions can be drawn. However, the purpose of this section is not to draw conclusions but to begin connecting the dots of existing data in order to learn what patterns and problems are already taking shape.

Current Communication Instruction for Teachers

Little is currently known about the extent to which concepts about communication are incorporated into undergraduate or graduate education courses. Contemporary literature suggests that most schools of education have begun to include some kind of instruction in questioning techniques, nonstandard dialects, microteaching on videotape, and introductory elements of interaction analysis. Occasion-

ally, instruction is offered on perceptual differences and aspects of interpersonal skills. Several recent books (e.g., Good and Brophy's *Looking in Classrooms* or *Teacher-Student Relationships*, or Kraft's *The Living Classroom*)[3] stress the communicative aspects of the classroom; and (as the resource section of the present book illustrates) many other education writers are joining this trend by incorporating at least some elements of theory and skills of classroom communication into education textbooks. Lynn's findings (1974) indicate that at the graduate level, departments of education claim to be moving even more swiftly than speech communication departments in developing special instruction in communication for teachers.

Despite the signs that content about communication is cropping up in education courses, the changes appear to be occurring most often as a result of individual instructors' choices rather than as the result of the planned, deliberate objectives of an institution or professional association. Instruction in communication in both graduate and undergraduate education courses appears highly dependent upon the interests, preparation, and skills of individual instructors. For this reason, it is extremely difficult to determine the extent and level of instruction *actually* occurring in education courses.

It is somewhat easier to determine the nature of instruction in communication for teachers in courses offered by speech communication departments. Course titles and syllabi deal more directly with identifiable units in communication theory and skills. As a result, a fairly good notion can be gained concerning what kinds of instruction speech communication departments are currently offering non-speech teachers and teachers in training.

National Survey Findings

Two recent dissertations (Anderson, 1970; Lynn, 1974) have presented considerable quantities of information on the nature and extent of communication instruction available to elementary and secondary teachers at pre-baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate levels.[4] Anderson's study involved a nationwide survey of basic undergraduate speech communication courses designed primarily for future classroom teachers. Lynn's study surveyed graduate-level courses in the theory and skills of classroom communication available to practicing elementary and secondary teachers. Since Lynn's study was organized similarly to Anderson's, it is possible to compare their findings on several dimensions and to sketch a rough image of the nature and extent of speech communication training received by non-speech teachers today. The discussion which follows presents a synopsis of the methodology of these studies and their survey results.

Selecting the Institutions

Both Anderson and Lynn chose to consider only institutions accredited by the NCATE,[5] adding to this population the major teacher-training institutions in the three states having no NCATE-accredited institutions: University of Alaska, University of Hawaii, and University of Delaware. Likewise, both researchers used a regional classification system corresponding to the regional designations of the SCA.[6] (For the purpose of this report, Anderson's additional classifications have been omitted.[7]) Anderson's population included all undergraduate speech communication departments at NCATE institutions (N=458). Lynn's population included NCATE institutions offering a minimum of a master's degree for elementary and/or secondary teachers (N=300). Since Lynn's responses came from a variety of departments, responses were categorized either as "*speech*" (if the response came from an academic department of the communication arts or sciences [including speech, speech communication, communication, drama/theater]) or "*non-speech*" (if the response came from an education or other non-speech-communication department). Almost all of Lynn's non-speech responses came from education departments.

Identifying the Courses

By examining current course catalogs, Anderson discovered that, of the 458 institutions meeting his selection criteria, 137 listed a course (1) which appeared to be a basic speech communication course designed primarily for classroom teachers (e.g., "Applied Oral Communication for Teachers," "Speech in Instruction"), and (2) which was offered in a program of the communication arts and sciences or staffed by such a department (including speech, communication, and/or drama-theater).[8] From 137 questionnaires mailed to department chairmen, 116 responses were received (an 84 percent response).[9] After screening the responses, Anderson identified ninety-four basic speech communication courses designed primarily for classroom teachers.[10] (For a listing of the schools offering these ninety-four courses, see Appendix A.)

Lynn's methodology was more complex. Prior to her study there was no sure way to identify courses in classroom communication by title, by departmental affiliation, or by faculty-administrator responsibility. No dialogue among teachers of such courses had been established through professional associations. No mailing lists existed. Inquiries to individuals teaching such courses, sent through speech communication departments, had yielded only the most meager information on the existence of other similar courses. Thus, since a direct mailing to teachers of such courses was not possible, an alternative approach was designed, based on three assumptions.

1. Practicing, non-speech teachers seeking a graduate-level course in classroom communication would most likely consider a school or department of education as a primary source of information.
2. The persons most likely to be contacted for such information would be the dean of the school (or department) of education, the director of graduate teacher education, and/or the director of graduate continuing education.
3. These three categories of persons would be the administrators most likely to know if one or more courses in classroom communication were offered at that institution, and to know the department and faculty member(s) to whom a questionnaire might be forwarded.[11]

This study required administrators from the field of education to identify courses in "classroom communication" and then to forward questionnaires to the instructors of such courses. It was therefore necessary to define "classroom communication" in a way that an administrator could quickly and accurately identify a relevant course, instructor, and department. Recipient instructors, in turn, had to be able to judge quickly if (s)he were an eligible respondent. In a four-stage philologic process, Lynn ascertained that "classroom communication" was most widely considered to refer only to "the verbal and nonverbal interaction between teacher and students, and between or among students."[12] She also determined that courses in classroom communication most commonly would focus upon one or more of the following eighteen dimensions:

teachers' skills in
explaining, giving information, lecturing,
questioning,
listening and/or reacting to students,
stimulating and developing the oral skills of students,
improving communication between student and classmate,
resolving conflicts,
communicating in an "open" classroom setting,
using a wider range of methods for expressing approval and disapproval,
utilizing interaction-analysis tools,
recognizing speech problems in the classroom for referral to appropriate corrective agencies,
controlling more effectively the communicative climate in the classroom;

teachers' understanding of
the development of oral language in children,
socioeconomic, cultural/subcultural, and sexual variables affecting speech communication in a classroom,

various nonverbal factors which influence classroom communication,
factors affecting the teacher's own communicative behaviors (dogmatism, stereotyping, etc.),
the interdependence of speech and personality,
interpersonal communication and practical application of such theory in the classroom,
speech principles and practices, with practical application to the classroom situation.

Using the definition and eighteen dimensions of classroom communication given above, Lynn contacted three administrators at each of the 300 NCATE institutions (N=900), asking them to "pass on this request to the instructor of such a course, *wherever it is taught on your campus.*"[13] Responses were obtained from 233 of the 300 schools involved, or 77.66 percent of the schools.[14] From the 233 institutions, 139 faculty members responded indicating that they offered a relevant course. After screening the responses, Lynn identified ninety-two courses which were (1) taught at the graduate level, (2) open to teachers of all subjects, (3) scheduled at times *other than* weekdays during the daytime of the regular school year, and (4) in which at least one-half of the total class time was claimed to be spent on one or more of the eighteen listed dimensions of classroom communication.[15] (For a listing of the schools offering these ninety-two courses, see Appendix B.)

Table 1
Courses in Communication
for Teachers at NCATE Institutions[16]

	Speech:				Non-Speech:				
SCA Region:	W	S	C	E	W	S	C	E	Total
Basic undergraduate courses designed primarily for future teachers (Anderson)	24	22	38	10	—	—	—	—	94
Graduate courses in classroom communication designed for practicing teachers (Lynn)	9	1	11	11	10	12	23	15	92

Both Anderson and Lynn reported their data according to the four geographical regions of the Speech Communication Association: Western, Southern, Central, and Eastern. Appendixes A and B list participating institutions.

Prevalence of Courses

Table 1 shows the numbers of courses identified by both Anderson and Lynn, distributed by geographical region. Both researchers acknowledged that the courses identified are not the only higher education courses of this type offered in the United States. What is significant is that these studies document for the first time in several decades organized communication courses designed specifically for classroom teachers.

Anderson found that only a minority of teacher-education students enrolled in NCATE institutions received speech communication training in courses designed primarily for classroom teachers. Out of the 458 NCATE institutions considered, only 94 offered such a course and, of that number, only 19 required the course of all prospective teachers.[17]

As Table 1 indicates, Lynn found that non-speech departments claimed to offer almost twice as many graduate-level courses in classroom communication as did speech communication departments (60:32). To some extent, this finding is a consequence of mailing the questionnaires to educational administrators rather than to speech communication departments.[18] Nonetheless, this ratio is highly significant in light of other differences between speech and non-speech courses.

Course Titles

Both Anderson and Lynn found considerable diversity in the titles used to designate speech communication courses for teachers. At the undergraduate level, Anderson found few titles exactly alike in wording. However, most titles were similar to the extent of expressing some combination of two essential concepts: (1) "speech," "communication," or "oral," and (2) "classroom," "teacher," "learning," "instruction," or "school" (e.g., "Instructional Communication," or "Speech Communication in the Classroom").

Lynn, too, found a wide variety of course listings. Curiously, however, many of the titles of courses meeting her criteria did not appear clearly related to the content which instructors claimed to cover. Of the sixty non-speech courses (primarily in education) allegedly giving more than one-half of class contact time to units dealing directly with the study's eighteen dimensions of classroom communication, thirty courses bore titles giving no hint that the course was significantly devoted to communicative processes. Titles included "Systems of Teaching," "Improvement of Instruction," "Analysis of Teaching," "Home-School-Community Relations."[19] Given this information, Lynn proposed two possible explanations:

1. Schools of education may be including large portions of communication instruction in graduate courses bearing long-standing titles rather than attempting to go through administrative processes to align titles more closely to the content covered.
2. Through lack of exposure to the field of communication, education faculties may perceive the substantive nature of communication theory in a way different from that familiar to speech communication professionals and, as a consequence, may erroneously assume that all courses dealing with instruction automatically and adequately cover classroom communication.[20]

Table 2
Number of Years
Courses Have Been Offered[21]

	Speech:				Non-Speech:			
	W	S	C	E	W	S	C	E
1-5 years[22]								
Anderson	6	9	11	3	—	—	—	—
Lynn	5	—	8	9	6	8	13	8
6-10 years								
Anderson	9	3	7	2	—	—	—	—
Lynn	1	1	1	1	3	2	8	5
11-20 years								
Anderson	7	6	13	1	—	—	—	—
Lynn	2	—	2	1	1	2	2	1
Over 20 years								
Anderson	1	3	4	2	—	—	—	—
Lynn	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

Number of Years the Courses Have Been Offered

As Table 2 illustrates, both Anderson and Lynn found that the majority of courses in communication for teachers had originated within a few years preceding their respective studies. Anderson observed particularly rapid growth in basic undergraduate courses for teachers in the Western and Central areas,[23] with the majority of the courses in all regions originating within the decade preceding his study (1960-1970).[24]

Lynn's study revealed an even more recent pattern of development, with most (62 percent) of the courses in classroom communication having been offered less than five years and nearly all (86 percent)

having been offered less than ten years. It is particularly noteworthy that 58 percent of the non-speech courses appeared to have been offered for less than five years; they thus originated during a time when most schools of education have been forced to cut back or put a freeze on existing courses.[25] In addition, Lynn found that more than one-third (38 percent) of the ninety-two respondents at the graduate level were planning expansion in the near future. They planned either to offer additional sections of an existing course or to add courses in an aspect of classroom communication. Of this number, fourteen speech communication courses reported definite expansion plans, and twenty-one non-speech courses reported similar expectations.[26]

Course Designs

Anderson found that the basic undergraduate speech communication course for teachers was designed mainly as a three-hour, three-credit course for juniors and seniors. Some schools permitted graduate students to enroll and receive credit.[27] Most of the classes reported enrollments of between twenty-one and thirty students.[28] Although most schools indicated that the course was designed for both elementary and secondary teacher-education students, the majority of the students were elementary-education students.[29] Across all regions and institutions, the predominant pattern seemed to be to offer only one section of the undergraduate course per academic session (semester, quarter, term).[30] Most institutions required no prerequisites for these courses,[31] assumed that enrolling students had little or no previous speech communication training,[32] and viewed the course as a terminal speech communication course for the classroom teacher.[33] Very few institutions conducted any type of a proficiency examination as a screening device, evaluative measure, or special requirement. Where used, oral proficiency examinations were administered to exempt students from taking the course.[34] Both Anderson's and Lynn's studies showed that, while most schools allowed speech communication majors to enroll in the course, both the graduate and undergraduate courses enrolled predominantly non-speech-communication majors.[35]

At the graduate level, Lynn found that, while courses in classroom communication were generally offered as regular semester or quarter-long courses, 13 percent (n = 12) were available through special scheduling arrangements to make the course convenient for the employed teacher.[36] Overall, the scheduling arrangements were so diverse as to suggest that each course had been tailored to meet the special time limitations of teachers. In addition to offering the selected courses on the campuses of their respective schools, 75 percent of the non-speech courses and 47 percent of the speech courses were given off-campus, too. Although classes were usually scheduled once a week

for two to four hours on a weekday evening, alternative methods were reported [illegible] sive weekends, as summer workshops [illegible] as day-long Saturday sessions, as [illegible] plinary degree programs. Course [illegible] three credits per course, depending on [illegible] work completed outside of class. [illegible] selection of work options in variable [illegible]

In courses offered by non-speech [illegible] clearly toward large annual [illegible] courses] enrolling 30–100 students. [illegible] students, and one course enrolling [illegible] 1972–73 academic year. During the same [illegible] speech communication departments [illegible] with 50 percent enrolling 30 or fewer [illegible] speech communication courses reported [illegible] 200, and five courses reported [illegible]

Student demand for graduate [illegible] strong. Among non-speech courses [illegible] certification.[8] Responses from [illegible] ments suggested that enrollments [illegible] respondents indicated they would be [illegible] the course if it were published [illegible] responses did not show rapid expansion of graduate [illegible] the 1973–74 academic year, enrollments [illegible] speech communication and non-speech [illegible] indicate that speech communication [illegible] new or relatively new teacher, while [illegible] courses were designed for teachers with more than [illegible] ence.[9] The largest number of graduate courses [illegible] been designed to attract teachers from [illegible] years experience and who resided [illegible] campus. Most courses enrolled [illegible] the same sections, but provided [illegible] the class had begun.[10]

Financial Support for Graduate [illegible]

Because educational institutions [illegible] in recent years, Lynn asked [illegible] financed. While most of the selected [illegible] regular college budgets, 16 percent [illegible] outside financial support [illegible] from a teacher's union, a private [illegible] inservice work, and cost sharing [illegible]

communication. Instructors of graduate courses reported that the greatest amount of emphasis was given to units stressing the following:

listening and reacting to students,
improving communication between/among students,
communicating in an "open" classroom setting,
more effectively controlling the communicative climate in the classroom,
understanding nonverbal factors influencing communication in the classroom,
understanding how to apply theory of interpersonal communication to the classroom.

Important differences were reported in time spent by speech and non-speech courses on such units. The majority of speech communication courses (62.5 percent) included more than thirty-six class hours dealing with the eighteen dimensions of classroom communication; more than half (57 percent) of the non-speech courses dealt with these units fewer than thirty-six class hours. Overall, speech communication courses offered more intensive academic experiences and provided more hours of classroom instruction in classroom communication to smaller groups of students.

Among the ninety-two courses studied, the areas least stressed throughout the nation included the following:

recognizing speech problems for referral to appropriate corrective agencies,
explaining, giving information, lecturing,
understanding children's oral language development,
applying speech principles and practices to the classroom situation.

Two other topics which received less than moderate stress were the effect of socioeconomic, cultural/subcultural, and sexual variables upon classroom communication, and the interdependence of speech and personality.

Non-speech courses gave stronger emphasis than speech courses in the following dimensions of classroom communication (in rank order, with the most strongly emphasized topic first):

questioning ability,
utilizing interaction analysis tools,
improving communication between/among students,
communicating in an "open" classroom setting,
understanding factors affecting the teacher's communicative behaviors (dogmatism, stereotyping, etc.).

Speech courses gave a stronger emphasis than non-speech courses in the following (in rank order, with the most strongly emphasized topic first):

understanding speech principles and practices, with practical application to the classroom,
understanding socioeconomic, cultural/subcultural, and sexual variables affecting speech communication in the classroom,
understanding children's development of oral language,
recognizing speech problems in the classroom,
more effectively controlling the communicative climate in the classroom.

By combining Anderson's findings with Lynn's, some interesting conclusions can be drawn. Lynn's research showed that teacher educators giving graduate courses generally assumed that teachers needed no instruction in how to explain or give information. Supposedly, practicing teachers had already received such instruction during their undergraduate education. Contrastingly, Anderson's findings showed that the overwhelming majority of teachers have received no such instruction during their undergraduate training. Furthermore, the minority who have received any kind of performance instruction have in the main simply given public speeches to college peers. Instruction in public speaking may be useful for teachers, but these skills alone are not sufficient to develop the more comprehensive communicative skills teachers are expected to employ in their professional work. Day-to-day teaching also involves such activities as resolving classroom conflicts, explaining multiplication or democracy to thirty to forty non-adults (many of whom do not see the need to give attention), or clarifying programs of individualized instruction for thirty children who must somehow be dealt with one at a time. In short, if only a minority of NCATE graduates have had the opportunity to take a speech communication course designed primarily for teachers, and if neither elementary nor secondary teachers are being required to demonstrate oral competencies for certification, it may not be safe to make any assumptions about a teacher's prior communicative knowledge or skills. On the evidence, course planners need to reconsider carefully those areas of study which Lynn's study showed received the least amount of stress. Planners ought to determine, class by class, whether such de-emphasis is justifiable.

Textbooks

Neither Anderson nor Lynn found common use of textbooks. In the eighty-two institutions participating in Anderson's study, seventy different books were reportedly used as the "course textbook." The

remaining twelve schools required no single text for their students. Of the seventy titles identified to Anderson, only eleven books were used in more than two schools.[50] Similarly, Lynn found only fourteen books being used by more than one institution, but her respondents reported a total of ninety different books required for students. As might be expected in graduate-level courses, recommended reading lists returned to Lynn showed heavy use of supplementary reading in periodicals, and a significant number of instructors indicated that journal articles constituted the only required reading for their courses.[51]

On the basis of the reading lists submitted to Lynn, it appears that speech communication instructors have only the most limited exposure to books on classroom communication which have been produced in the field of education. Likewise, it appears that non-speech instructors are uninformed about the many books produced in the field of speech communication. In general, reading lists contained only minimal recommended readings from outside the instructors' own academic fields.

A number of the textbooks reportedly used at the graduate level are, essentially, basic communication books—ones that are commonly used in lower-level undergraduate speech communication courses. (Examples of these are: Berlo's *Process of Communication*, Stewart's *Bridges Not Walls*, Hayakawa's *Language in Thought and Action*, Fabun's *Communications: The Transfer of Meaning*, and Powell's *Why Am I Afraid to Tell You Who I Am?*). A number of schools also reported the use of certain books on nonverbal communication which have received widespread attention but which include inaccuracies, distortions, and extremely elementary insights into nonverbal communication.

While the content of the basic communication books just referred to is valid (though dated in specific cases), it is surprising that practicing teachers should be unfamiliar (or judged to be so by their instructors) with such basic knowledge. If, on the other hand, the choice of such books does not reflect the students' level of knowledge, the choices of textbooks must indicate a lack of knowledge on the part of the *instructor* regarding either a substantial grasp of communication theory, or the availability of textbooks dealing with communication theory and applications of such theory at more advanced and pertinent levels.

Course Syllabi

No data has been gathered on the syllabi used at the graduate level, but Anderson reported that 64 percent of the undergraduate courses he studied used syllabi or course guides. Courses in large public institutions used syllabi more frequently than those in smaller, or

private schools. Unfortunately, no means currently exists by which instructors of such courses can systematically exchange syllabi or course ideas. There are no channels by which teachers of such courses can identify and communicate with one another. As a consequence, few course syllabi are available as models for developers of courses. At this time, only two comprehensive course guides have been disseminated to any great extent outside of the institutions where they were developed. They are the following:

1. James Booth and Jody Nyquist, "Communication in Educational Environments: A Basic Course." (A detailed syllabus of a course offered to prospective teachers, presented at the SCA annual convention, Houston, 1975.) The authors may be contacted at the University of Washington, Speech Department, Seattle.
2. Elizabeth M. Lynn and Kurt W. Ritter, "Classroom Communication: A Flexible Teacher Training Program in Classroom Communication (1972)." (A lengthy, annotated resource guide for developing specific units in classroom communication for advanced undergraduate or graduate-level students.) This manual is currently an ERIC document, ED 079 793.

Opportunities are needed to allow instructors and developers of courses in both speech communication and education to gather and share ideas and course syllabi and to assist each other in strengthening instruction. However, as conference costs continue to rise and university travel allowances continue to shrink, there appears to be little likelihood of this needed, face-to-face interdisciplinary exchange occurring.

Instructional Methods

Because Anderson and Lynn used different reporting techniques, their findings regarding teaching methods and class activities are difficult to compare. For more thorough information, reference should be made to the respective dissertations.[32]

Overall, teacher-led discussions comprised the most frequently used method at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, with all courses using them moderately to frequently. Small-group discussions appeared to be used more frequently in graduate than in undergraduate courses. In graduate courses they were used moderately to frequently. The information reported by Anderson suggests less frequent use of discussion at the undergraduate level, with little more than one-third of the courses using this method frequently and 44 percent using it occasionally.

In both graduate and undergraduate courses, instructors reported giving only infrequent lectures. At the graduate level, lectures were reported as very infrequently used. At the undergraduate level, 63

percent of the instructors indicated that they gave only "occasional" lectures.

Individual speeches or oral reports appear to be a far more common instructional method in the performance-oriented undergraduate courses than in the graduate courses. Half of the undergraduate courses frequently used this method, with more than an additional third of the courses using it occasionally. In contrast, few graduate courses used this method at all.

The majority of both undergraduate and graduate courses reported using individual written reports occasionally. Anderson found that in 57 percent of the undergraduate courses a term paper or project was required. At the graduate level, however, Lynn found that only 36 percent of reporting instructors assigned research term papers, with a proportionately lower percentage of such assignments occurring in non-speech courses (33 percent) than in speech communication courses (41 percent).

Written examinations seem very rarely used at the graduate level. Among undergraduate courses, 63 percent reportedly used written examinations occasionally. At the undergraduate level, close to half of the courses used micro-teaching as an instructional method, with most of these instructors reporting occasional use. Most graduate courses used it seldom-to-occasionally. Programmed instruction was used very seldom at both levels.

Additional methods used at the undergraduate level included individual conferences, oral reading or interpretative performances, group oral reports, and group written reports. More than half of the undergraduate courses reported using individual conferences occasionally, with 12 percent using them frequently. Forty-three percent of the courses used oral readings or interpretative performances by students occasionally, with an additional 19 percent using this method frequently. Over one-third of the courses reported occasional use of group oral reports, 12 percent reporting frequent use. One-fifth of the courses reported occasional use of reports written by groups.

Additional instructional methods used at the graduate level included communication games and exercises, with most courses reporting occasional to regular use of this method; occasional use of simulations of classroom situations; and occasional analyses of filmed or taped classroom situations. Classroom observations and visitations were infrequently used in most courses due to expense and/or inconvenience. Despite the low frequency of use, instructors generally felt such activities to be highly relevant and worthwhile.

Lynn's report also covered a list of assignments commonly made in graduate-level courses. The following list ranks these from the most common assignment to the least common assignment. Noticeable

differences between courses offered by speech communication departments and those offered by non-speech departments are identified.

1. Analysis of communication problems, situations, or studies of cases which have occurred in classes taught by students. (Required by 85 percent of the speech communication courses and by 78 percent of the non-speech courses.)
2. Required reading.
3. Student-led discussions.
4. Self-diagnosis of significant weaknesses in classroom communication and practical application of a plan to overcome those weaknesses. (Required in 58 percent of the non-speech courses and in 50 percent of the speech communication courses.)
5. 6. 7.
   Interaction-analysis reports on the verbal behavior in an observed classroom.
   Communication mini-lessons presented and evaluated in the graduate class.
   Summaries of student feedback on the teachers' verbal and nonverbal communication.
8. Reports on the success of communication exercises assigned to be run in students' own classrooms.
9. 10.
   Analyses of communication situations in other classrooms in the students' own schools.
   Research term papers.
11. Oral reports on reading. (Required in 41 percent of the speech communication courses and in 25 percent of the non-speech courses.)
12. Lesson plans (and follow-up evaluation) for communication lessons to be taught in students' own classrooms. (Required in 38 percent of the speech communication courses and in 23 percent of the non-speech courses.)

Typical Course Activities

The instructional pattern that emerges at the undergraduate level is of a course that is led by the teacher but which is clearly oriented toward student performance. Lectures by the teacher are only occasional events, the bulk of class activity being directed toward increasing a variety of each student's skills. A large portion of class time is reserved for individual students' presentations. Students are expected to participate occasionally in small-group discussions and, possibly, to share in a group's oral report to the class. Most likely, they will also be expected to demonstrate competency in orally interpreting written material. In close to half the courses, students are assigned no

term papers or projects but, in most courses, they are expected to pass occasional written examinations.

The pattern that emerges at the graduate level is of a course in which the instruction alternates between teacher-led discussions and student-led small-group discussions. Instructors' lectures are rare, as are individual presentations by class members. Particularly in courses offered by non-speech departments no research term papers are assigned nor are there written examinations. Discussion topics appear to relate to (1) communication problems or situations occurring in classes taught by class members (or in other classrooms), (2) required reading, and (3) videotaped or filmed classroom situations. In class, students are expected to participate in communication games or exercises and to develop plans for overcoming their own communicative shortcomings as teachers.

It is worth noting that, typically, neither undergraduate nor graduate courses allow much time for students to develop a significant, comprehensive grasp of communication theory except, possibly, through assigned reading. The performance orientation of the undergraduate courses narrows the instructional choices to those methods and content which primarily develop only sending skills. Because these basic courses are generally considered to be both first and final courses in communication for prospective teachers, instructors are under considerable pressure to bring students' skills to at least a minimally acceptable level for classroom teaching. In the same way, the emphasis upon specific classroom situations in graduate courses may be too limiting to provide students with a broad and deep understanding of communication. As Anderson's study shows, only a small minority of prospective teachers have been exposed in their undergraduate education to fundamental speech communication theory, or to a guided self-analysis of the communication methods they employ with other individuals or within groups. There is then little knowledge and experience on which to base situational analysis at the graduate level.

On the bases of both Anderson's and Lynn's surveys, it is evident that no single course can begin to meet all the communication needs of classroom teachers. Whether students in such courses are prospective or practicing teachers, they enter their courses after coming through an educational system which has given them little, if any, theoretical foundation in rhetorical or communicative processes. They have little understanding of objectives or methods in discussion and little awareness of how to improve their own speaking, listening, and responding. Lacking such fundamental preparation, students enroll in undergraduate courses needing to learn not only basic principles about their own communication, but also far more sophisticated concepts in order to effectively control communication in a classroom and to

develop the communicative abilities of their students. Consequently, despite the growth in students' skills which the instructors of graduate and undergraduate courses reported, both Anderson and Lynn found the instructors acutely aware of the vast gap remaining after a single course between the growth which had occurred and remaining, unmet needs of teachers for understanding communication and developing further skills.

Faculty Credentials

Anderson reported that during the 1969-70 academic year, 236 instructors had been assigned to teach the ninety-four courses included in his study. Of that number, most held academic ranks below that of associate professor, and most did not have doctorates.[54] On the graduate level, Lynn found 78 instructors teaching ninety-two courses. Of that number, 43 percent (n=77) were identified as associate or full professors. However, 57 percent of the non-speech instructors (n=62) were reported to hold senior rank, but only 22 percent of the speech communication instructors (n=15) enjoyed similar status. Additionally, considering the level of the courses, Lynn found a surprisingly low percentage of doctoral degrees held by instructors. Table 3 compares the information provided by Anderson and Lynn.

Table 3
Course Instructors
Holding Senior Rank Doctorate[54]

	Anderson (N = 236)		Lynn (N = 178)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate full professors	74	31	77	43
Ph.D. Ed.D.	84	36	96	54

Since all participants in Anderson's study were affiliated with speech communication departments, Anderson safely assumed that all had had major training in speech communication.[55] By inquiring about their areas of concentration, he learned that 25 percent of the teachers had had major training in "general speech," 20 percent had focused upon rhetoric and public address, 19 percent had emphasized speech education, and 15 percent had stressed drama/theater. Regional comparisons showed significant differences in the teachers' preparations. Western instructors tended to have backgrounds in general speech communication or in rhetoric and public address; Southern instructors tended toward communication theory and research; instructors in the Central states had backgrounds stressing general

speech communication and speech education; and, in the East, instructors' backgrounds tended to be in drama/theater and speech pathology/audiology.[56]

In contrast, Lynn found that only half of her respondents had special qualifications for teaching graduate courses in classroom communication and that public school teaching experience was far more commonly required than educational preparation in speech communication.[57] Corroborating this was Lynn's further finding that most of the instructors of graduate courses in classroom communication had no major training in any speech communication area (since most were affiliated with non-speech departments). Most schools appeared not to require a terminal degree in speech communication of the instructors chosen to teach such courses. As a whole, non-speech instructors reported having only the most limited graduate training in communication, or had no academic speech communication background at all. In contrast, the vast majority of instructors affiliated with speech communication departments reported major concentrations in speech communication in graduate study. Among the speech communication directors of such courses, the majority had done graduate work in speech communication education (78 percent) and in interpersonal communication or small-group communication (59 percent), and 47 percent had graduate-level study in rhetoric and/or communication theory. Only three of the sixty non-speech directors of such courses

Table 4
Major Area of Training of Course Instructors[58]

	Anderson: Total	Lynn: Speech	Non-Speech	Total
General Speech Communication	59	3	1	4
Rhetoric and Public Address	47	2	—	2
Speech Education	43	18	3	21
Drama/Theatre	36	1	—	1
Communication Theory & Research	25	6	1	7
Rhetorical Theory	—	1	—	1
Speech Pathology & Audiology	21	—	—	—
Interpretation	5	—	—	—
Small-Group Communication	—	2	—	2
Socio- and Psycholinguistics	—	4	1	5
Language Arts	—	2	—	2
Curriculum & Instruction	—	1	10	11
Other	—	—	60	60
No Response	—	29	33	62
Total Number of Instructors	236	69	109	178

claimed more than twenty-five graduate credit (semester-equivalent) hours in speech communication.[59] Table 4 compares the reported speech communication preparation of the instructors, as reported in Anderson's and Lynn's studies. The comparatively large numbers of undergraduate instructors with strong communication backgrounds reported by Anderson stand in stark contrast to the relative few who are currently involved in graduate instruction in classroom communication. By piecing together the facts on the graduate-level courses—that most schools do not require instructors to have advanced or terminal degrees in speech communication, that several schools consider brief workshop training to be adequate preparation for their instructors,[60] that most of the senior faculty teaching such courses are from non-speech departments, and that most non-speech faculty have had little or no graduate preparation in speech communication—it seems safe to conclude that non-speech faculty are rapidly developing courses in oral communication around very limited knowledge of speech communication.[61]

Anderson found that less than half of the instructors of undergraduate courses for prospective teachers reported any previous teaching or administrative experience at either the elementary or secondary level. The largest percentages of those reporting such prior experiences were instructors who had taught only at the secondary level (24 percent) or at *both* elementary and secondary levels (14 percent).[62] In light of the fact that most of the students enrolled in these courses anticipated working at the elementary level, it is puzzling that so few teachers with elementary backgrounds were working in these positions.

In contrast to Anderson's findings, Lynn's responses showed that graduate-level instructors had far more extensive pre-college teaching experience. Sixty-eight percent of the directors of graduate-level courses had had secondary teaching experience, and 38 percent had had elementary teaching experience. By a wide margin, more non-speech directors reported public school experience than did teachers in speech communication departments.[63] Overall, the data on the graduate courses suggests that it is the older, more experienced, non-speech faculty and the younger, less experienced, speech communication faculty members who are most actively involved in these courses, with the speech communication faculty offering the most solid academic preparation and the non-speech faculty offering the greatest experience in teaching at pre-college levels.

Team Teaching

Despite the interdisciplinary nature of the content of courses in classroom communication, teaching responsibilities appear almost universally assumed by a single faculty member. At the under-

graduate level. Anderson found that instructors relied on occasional resource personnel when teaching such specialized subjects as speech pathology and audiology or creative drama. However, only one undergraduate course reportedly involved two teachers throughout the term.

Lynn did not deal with the question of team teaching but attempted to ascertain the extent of cooperation between speech communication and education departments. Information thus obtained on the graduate courses showed little interdisciplinary cooperation:

1. Lynn found no evidence at all of courses jointly developed or taught by speech communication and education faculty members. In cases where more than one faculty member was involved in a single course, all faculty members were from the same department, either speech communication or education.
2. Only two courses were taught by speech communication faculty members exclusively within education departments. These two courses were not listed in the speech communication departments' offerings.
3. Courses offered by speech communication departments (for non-speech teachers) were usually not cross-listed in education departments' offerings. In many institutions education administrators and education faculty members were not even aware that the speech communication department offered courses for non-speech teachers.

Evaluation of Courses

Perhaps because so many of the courses studied were only recently developed, both Lynn and Anderson found that, while most of the courses used some method of course evaluation, little effort had been made to measure course outcomes scientifically or to estimate long-range effectiveness.[54] Comments volunteered to both researchers suggested that, generally, students' responses to the courses were highly favorable. However, both Anderson and Lynn received complaints from frustrated instructors to the effect that, within the limitations of a single course, there was simply no way to compensate for the students' limitations in communication education, much less to meet the wide range of needs that students would encounter professionally.[55]

Summary

In summary, within the past decade, there has been a spurt of instruction in classroom communication for teachers. National surveys by Anderson and Lynn have begun to describe the extent and nature of this growth as reflected in basic speech communication

courses designed primarily for teachers and in graduate-level courses in the theory and skills of classroom communication for practicing teachers. Developers of similar courses are advised to refer directly to the Anderson and Lynn dissertations for abundant supplementary information.

The recent growth of courses appears related to an increasing recognition on the part of non-speech teacher educators that classroom teachers have special communication needs. This interest has led to increased involvement by non-speech faculties in courses dealing with communication, a trend which suggests several potential problems. The most obvious problem appears to be that the vast majority of non-speech trainers of teachers who offer such courses have little or no academic preparation in speech communication. Off-setting this limitation is the strong experiential advantage which education faculties appear to have over speech communication faculties. Since much of the content taught by non-speech persons in graduate courses appears designed to attract the same student population as courses offered by speech communication departments, course planners should anticipate intra-institutional competition unless efforts are made to incorporate interdepartmental cooperation into course designs.

University Programs of Special Interest

Since Anderson and Lynn conducted their respective surveys, there has been additional evidence of growth in instruction in classroom communication. For example, a graduate course in "Teaching as a Performing Art" (TAPA) recently has been introduced at the University of South Carolina. At the time of Anderson's and Lynn's surveys, no NCATE institution within that state offered any kind of communication course designed for teachers. This newly developed course uses basic acting skills to heighten verbal and nonverbal message-sending skills in the classroom. Within a short time, word of the course has spread rapidly. Nearly 100 inquiries from other interested educators were received even before news of the course appeared in a national news magazine.[66] This university maintains a drama department but not a speech communication department.[67] The present author does not know the extent to which the drama faculty at the University of South Carolina have been involved in development or instruction in this course.

At the time of Lynn's survey, West Virginia University began rapidly developing an off-campus series of inservice graduate-level courses on interpersonal communication in the classroom, communication problems of children (recognition of speech disorders, reticence, and listening development), and nonverbal communication. Offered through the WVU extension division, these courses have been team-

taught by speech communication faculty members (or with assistance from graduate students) in intensive six-day summer workshops. An early report (1975) indicates that the courses are extremely successful and that continued rapid expansion is planned.[59]

The following section describes in detail several instructional designs developed for graduate programs in classroom communication. Since these programs seem easily adaptable to other institutions, the descriptions are offered to aid schools seeking ways to initiate or improve programs in classroom communication or exploring methods to make such courses more available to practicing teachers. More thorough descriptions of each program can be found in the Lynn dissertation.

The Teacher Workshop Program (TWP) of Pennsylvania State University[60] is offered by the Speech Communication Department in conjunction with the University's Division of Continuing Education. This program in classroom communication for non-speech teachers is one of the oldest and largest in the country. Since the inception of the program in 1966, the TWP faculty (including doctoral students) have traveled throughout Pennsylvania, offering intensive semester-length equivalent courses to thousands of schoolteachers. At the present time, enrollment in TWP courses has leveled off to a steady 1,000 teachers per academic year. Initially funded under a five-year federal grant, the TWP has operated well into the black each year since the grant's termination. In 1973, for example, with the tuition cost at $93.00 for three credits, the TWP reported a one-year surplus after expenses, of $76,558. While this instructional model may not be directly applicable in institutions with large numbers of graduate students and supportive extension divisions, the helpful faculty members in this program have long ago discovered answers which most other schools have not yet identified the questions.

For most of the past decade, the TWP has offered three separate three-credit courses at extension centers throughout the state. The courses stress the teacher's ability to use communicative processes in the classroom, interpersonal communication in the classroom, and children's language development. During the 1975-76 year a number of one-credit courses were added, including oral reading for classroom teachers, nonverbal communication for the classroom teacher, creative speech and language activities for the elementary teacher, and creative movement, and skillbuilding in the language arts. There are no course prerequisites for any of these seven courses.

In addition, the department has also begun to offer some of its regular courses in selected extension centers. These courses have prerequisites and focus upon a comprehensive development of understanding and skills in communication rather than specifically upon classroom interaction. At the present time, these courses include the

have the option of enrolling for three graduate credits or for none. At the 1974 fee of $216 per student, estimated gross receipts for that year's Institute approximated $37,800 for an expected 175 student enrollment.

Whether universities are limited to providing on-campus courses for teachers, or whether they have the facilities for taking a course on the road, they may be interested in adopting a three-day workshop plan similar to the "Communication in Education" workshops developed at the University of Colorado.[72] At the present time, this program has been suspended, due to the departure of a key faculty member who served as coordinator; however, its design is worth mention. The elements of special interest in this program are its variable credit and multiple mini-course features.

A sample workshop offered a series of 2½-hour "short courses" from which participants selected those in which they wished to enroll. Each short course was separately titled to indicate its special content. The total program offered a full three days of instruction in scheduled periods beginning Friday night, extending through 9:00 or 10:00 at night, and ending Sunday afternoon. Depending on the number of instructors available for any single weekend, twelve to fifteen short courses were available. The short courses offered in one three-day workshop, for example, included:

The Teacher and the Communication Transaction,
Nonverbal Communication in the Classroom,
Group Discussion and the Classroom Instructor,
The Constructive Use of Conflict—Making and Using Trouble,
Communication Games in the Classroom,
Teachers as Lovers,
Creative Dramatics, Oral Interpretation, and Readers Theater for the Classroom,
The Teacher as Listener,
Personal Value Clarification,
The Teacher and Power,
The Constructive Use of Media,
Applied Motivational Theory in the Classroom,
Seeing the Other Point of View: Communication Skills through Children's Literature,
Cross-Cultural Communication,
Teaching Values to Adolescents through Their Current Literature.

Credit for the workshops was determined by a graduated scale of participation and tuition paid. Fees were minimal. For example, noncredit enrollment, costing $18.00, entitled a participant to register for as many as eight short courses. To receive one credit, the cost would be $25.50 for attendance at six of the short courses, after which the

participant would be expected to complete an outside project. For additional credit, the costs increased, along with the participation requirements.

Based on the experience gained from offering these workshops, the former director of the program recommended that course content be stretched out over a longer period of time to make a stronger impression on participants, and that workshops be offered within an individual school, so that many teachers from the same school could attend at the same time.

While Colorado's program is currently in limbo, Penn State's, Western Connecticut's, and Fordham's are thriving. Despite the differences among the three active programs, they share features worth noticing. All courses are popular with students; all have strong administrative support; all are financially solvent; all have been developed rather recently but have become more firmly established with each passing year. All program directors have managed to develop needed cooperation with interrelated departments (education, continuing education, speech communication, etc.). Additionally, all have managed to deal effectively with administrative powers in arranging for varying amounts of credit and for acceptance of the course in meeting state teaching requirements. All instructors have broad backgrounds combining communication study and educational practice. And, finally, all programs have limited the content of their courses to specifically defined areas of classroom communication.

Short-Term Inservice Instruction

According to Lynn's research, administrators appear to be seeking inservice programs and resources (1) which can be administered by available staff and which will not require the direction of outside professionals, (2) which will be short-term and inexpensive, (3) which will noticeably improve classroom behaviors, and (4) which will ultimately be judged interesting and worthwhile by teachers participating in them. Unfortunately, skills in classroom communication are not readily developed in programs meeting all four criteria, due to the following reasons:

1. Programs in the theory and skills of classroom communication do not appear adaptable to conduct by untrained staff. From all available research, it appears that skills in classroom communication require demonstration by an instructor who already possesses a high degree of that skill and in addition possesses a broad theoretical understanding of the nature of communication.
2. Short-term programs in classroom communication may produce no observable behavior changes. This is a problem affecting the

University of Colorado's "Communication in Education" workshops. Communicative patterns are closely related to attitudes toward self and others. To change a teacher's communicative behavior may require major attitudinal changes; such fundamental changes are rarely a consequence of brief inservice sessions. The value of brief inservice programs in classroom communication is also questionable when it is remembered that few teachers in the nation have received *any* kind of prior training in the theory or skills of communication. To a great extent, skillful use of communication depends upon understanding the variables affecting a given communicative situation, and developing such an understanding is far too involved to be mastered within a brief inservice program.

3. Finally, the inherently holistic nature of communication must be taken into consideration when single, isolated skills are taught. To the extent that an element of the communicative process can be taught as a discrete skill (e.g., the mechanics of vocal production, developing varied vocal inflections, interpreting nonverbal communication, soliciting responses, paraphrasing, etc.), that skill must be taught as an element which fits *naturally* into each individual teacher's existing pattern of communicative behaviors. A newly acquired communicative skill must not appear to be disproportionately emphatic to an observer. Focusing upon isolated skills without attempting to incorporate them into communicative milieus can produce distorted and altogether undesirable communicative behaviors. Integration of new or improved skills into existing patterns requires a high degree of motivation and persistence on the part of the practicing teacher and continuing empathic observation and feedback from an instructor.

In short, school administrators of inservice programs need to recognize that a theoretical understanding of communication must precede or at least accompany changes in communicative behaviors, and that behavioral changes occur only over an extended period of time. Once a theoretical foundation has been laid within a school, however, a wide variety of short-term programs dealing with specific classroom concerns in that school can be developed from that foundation. Topics amenable to short-term treatment include: appropriate responses to obscene language used by children, teaching children to appreciate and/or evaluate performances of peers, developing children's interactional skills in unstructured and/or structured groups, or providing supportive oral experiences for reticent children.

Guides to Resources

At the present time, three major guides are available. They identify a wide variety of audiovisual and packaged resources which might be of interest to course developers.

A catalog of teacher-training materials is available from the Florida Center for Teacher Training Materials. Address the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, P. O. Drawer 190, Chipley, Florida 32428.

A more comprehensive catalog (and supplement) of teacher-training materials has been published by the University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, and the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Albany, New York. The publications are: W. Robert Houston, *Resources for Performance-Based Education* (March 1973), and W. Robert Houston with Karen S. Nelson and Elizabeth C. Houston, *Resources for Performance-Based Education, Supplement* (November 1973).

The Seed Catalog: A Guide to Teaching Learning Materials, by Jeffrey Schrank (Boston: Beacon Press, 1974), is less traditional in both format and selection of contents but offers particularly useful evaluative information to help instructors select materials and distributors.

These catalogs do not generally index materials under headings familiar to speech communication instructors. However, despite the fact that the indexes and tables of contents may be of little help, these guides are filled with materials which appear extremely relevant to courses in classroom communication. Listings include extensive materials on language development in children, black dialects, group processes in the classroom, use of creative dramatics and storytelling, developing listening skills, human relations and interpersonal communication, nonverbal communication, and techniques of reporting and explaining.

Since publication of these guides, twelve half-hour teacher-training films on "Human Relations and School Discipline" have been produced by the New Jersey Education Association and broadcast by the New Jersey Public Broadcasting Authority in the fall of 1975.[73]

3

Questions and Answers

This section returns to the questions posed in the introduction to this publication and, on the basis of the information available, considers what is known, what may be impractical to learn, and what is worth determining.

Q: How prevalent are courses in classroom communication?

A: Following a 1970 national survey of speech communication departments, Anderson reported that, at that time, 27 percent of the NCATE-accredited undergraduate institutions (122 schools) offered a basic speech communication course specifically designed for teacher trainees. Of this number, nineteen schools required teacher trainees to take such a course.

In 1973-74 Lynn located ninety-two graduate-level courses in classroom communication offered by either the education or speech communication department of those NCATE institutions which offer graduate education degrees. Of this number, thirty-two courses were offered through speech communication departments and were taught by speech communication faculty, and sixty courses were offered by education departments and were taught primarily by education faculty.

Both Anderson and Lynn found that the majority of courses in communication for teachers had originated within the few years preceding their respective studies. Overall, the available evidence indicates that such courses are new and growing, despite economic constraints affecting the field of education.

Q: What specific communication competencies do *all* teachers need?

A: A start toward answering this question has been made through the forthcoming SCA/ATA Guidelines on Teacher Competencies in

Speech Communication, Mass Communication, and Theatre. This document will articulate with the SCA/ATA Guidelines for Speech Communication and Theatre Programs prepared according to the NCATE Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education for developing and assessing teacher preparation programs.[1] The competencies document will cite categories for the development of specific teacher competencies. The introduction to the current set of program guidelines indicates some of the areas which should be included in the preparation of all teachers:

> . . . speech communication and theatre programs need to provide opportunities for potential teachers across disciplines and academic levels to develop cognitive, psychomotor, and affective competencies related to discussion leadership, group problem-solving, appropriate message organization and delivery, a rich repertoire of non-verbal behaviors, aesthetic awareness, empathetic response, artistic sensitivity, sensitive evaluation of performance, and a support of the right to free speech.
>
> To fulfill the goal of facilitating pupils' competencies in speech communication and theatre, service programs for all teachers should include theoretical and practical components in application of language acquisition,communication development in relation to the development of self-concept and the role of interpersonal communication, and theatre arts methodologies in supportive learning environments with special contributions to experiential learning, e.g., role playing, creative dramatics, and simulation.[2]

Q: What kinds of information about communication should teachers at different levels be aware of?

A: The first section of this publication offers many suggestions to consider when developing courses for classroom teachers. Within the very near future, detailed guidelines will be available through the SCA which identify the types of speech communication instruction best suited to different stages of children's development. These guidelines have been developed by a team of speech communication researchers working under the direction of R. R. Allen (University of Wisconsin, Madison) on the SCA National Project on Speech Communication Competencies. The report, *Communication Competence in Children: A Developmental Perspective*, is in press at this writing.[3]

Elementary school teachers need to be aware of such subject matters as children's communicational development, language and communicative disorders, normal voice production and articulation, reticence, dialect differences, communicative elicitation techniques, oral interpretation (teacher techniques), and creative drama. All teachers of intermediate school children need to understand much of the same material. Less emphasis might be needed regarding language development and disorders in children, but greater emphasis might be placed upon such subjects as interpersonal communication, inter-

cultural communication, nonverbal communication, small-group discussion techniques, parliamentary procedure, and the relationship between communication and personality development. High school teachers need instruction similar to that received by elementary and intermediate teachers, with additional knowledge and skills in such subjects as intrapersonal communication, acceptable standards for oral communication (idea selection, organization, expression, and support for oral expression), discussion as a process for resolving problems and exploring ideas, semantics, conflict resolution, and group dynamics. If all teachers studied even fundamental principles operative in these aspects of communication, and if they applied this knowledge in their classes, speech communication teachers might finally be freed to teach the more highly refined theory and skills in which they have been trained. They might no longer be confronted with students who—after eleven or twelve years of essentially silent participation in school—beg to learn to "talk good" in one brief term of instruction.

Q: Does such instruction make a difference in teachers' subsequent behaviors?

A: It appears so. However, there is scant empirical research evidence at the present time. At the undergraduate level, little long-term research has been conducted to ascertain what abilities are retained once the teaching experience has begun. One particularly useful study by Hartzell, et al. (1973), suggests that, if a preservice course stresses interpersonal communication or human relations, the best results will be obtained if the course is offered prior to the student-teaching experience and if there are "booster" sessions during the student-teaching period for both student teachers and the professional staff with whom they interact.[4] Additional longitudinal research would be useful to determine which specific communication understandings and skills deteriorate most rapidly and which persist as an undergraduate goes through student teaching and begins a first, second, or third year of regular employment as a teacher. Such knowledge would be extremely valuable in designing both preservice and inservice courses.

At the graduate level, stronger evidence exists that courses in specific elements of classroom communication can be effective in producing change in teachers.[5] Inservice training programs reported by Lusty and Wood (1969) and by Marino (1971) clearly indicate that such programs can have significant positive effects upon teachers' attitudes.[6] The Marino study is of particular interest, not only because decidedly negative attitudes toward children were changed, but also because a highly effective program was described in sufficient detail that replication is relatively simple. Unfortunately, little information is available on the lasting nature of these changes. In one of the few

longitudinal studies at the graduate level, Coffey (1967) found statistically significant behavioral changes in teachers six months after a summer inservice training program."

Q: What kinds of instruction in classroom communication can be included effectively during preservice training and what kinds are more salient for inservice training?

A. At the present time, there are no guides. It appears that instructors are more conscious of the extensive needs of both prospective and practicing teachers for some kind of education in communication. Consequently, whatever speech communication content is deemed most essential is being incorporated into the courses which serve the greatest numbers of teachers. If institutional facilities include a strong and supportive continuing education division, a well-established extension division, and or a sizable instructional staff, the selected content is adapted to meet the needs of practicing teachers. If, because of institutional idiosyncrasies, there is a greater access to prospective teachers, similar content may be adjusted to address the needs of that group. As a consequence, for example, one instructor may present strong arguments for teaching intercultural communication to prospective teachers while another instructor may present equally strong arguments for teaching such content to practicing teachers. If this is the single greatest opportunity they each have to offer such instruction, they may both be right.

Q: Does on-site training cause greater improvements in a teacher's communicative behavior in the classroom than on-campus training?

A: According to Roy A. Edelfelt (professional associate for Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association), both experience and research "substantiate the view that improving a group's effort is more effective when members of a group are dealt with together in a context, rather than when each individual gets inservice training separately."[8] While similar opinions were voiced by both speech communication and non-speech respondents to Lynn's survey, no research has been conducted to determine which type of instruction has greater effect upon a teacher's in-class behavior.

Q: What problems should be anticipated in interdisciplinary research involving both the speech communication and education fields?

A: Regardless of whether research involves needs analysis or longitudinal outcomes of training programs, the greatest obstacles confronting an interdisciplinary researcher may well be the perceptual differences isolating each academic discipline.[9] As perceptions differ, so do the connotative meanings which representatives of each field attach to the language they use. For this reason, the words used by speech communication professionals may convey different meanings when they are used by educational professionals. For example, a significant number of education faculty members responding to Lynn's

survey submitted courses which they considered to be courses in classroom communication, despite acknowledging that less than half of the class time dealt with any of the specified content. Such responses were screened from the final survey findings which Lynn reported. However, on the basis of these responses it appears that a sizable number of education faculty members perceive that any course in analysis of instruction is, *ipso facto*, a course dealing primarily with classroom communication. In fact, such a course may almost wholly overlook teacher-to-student or student-to-student communicative interactions and focus instead on such other areas of instruction as the development and evaluation of course content and materials, student evaluation and testing methods, diagnostic instruments, current teaching aids (such as computer-assisted instruction or programmed materials), and/or theoretical models of instruction designed to produce specific learner behaviors.

Q: What resources are available for developing such courses?

A: In addition to the resource section of this publication, readers may wish to contact responsible faculty members at institutions mentioned under "University Programs of Special Interest" or at institutions in their own states or regions which offer such courses (see Appendixes A and B).

Q: Are consultants or financing available to get such courses underway?

A: Consultants are available to assist institutions in establishing such courses. Requests for such assistance should be directed to the Associate Secretary for Education, Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041.

Regarding financial assistance, over one-third of all non-speech courses in Lynn's survey reported receiving financial support from sources other than the regular budget, tuition, or fees paid by participants. Speech communication courses reported no support from such sources; nevertheless, it appears that outside money may be available, if it is sought. Schools presently considering the introduction or expansion of courses in classroom communication might benefit from approaching those funding sources in their area which, historically, have promoted excellence in teacher education. Additionally, as mentioned in Chapter 1, it appears that the National Institute on Education is considering funding research which could be integrated with the development of instruction in classroom communication.

4

Conclusion

This study has discussed the recent development and continuing growth of courses in the theory and skills of classroom communication for practicing teachers. These courses encompass those understandings and skills connected with the processes of teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student verbal and nonverbal interaction. The development of such courses has received strong, positive support from the speech communication and education professions, and there are indications that some states are adopting certification requirements specifying certain kinds of competencies in classroom communication. Additionally, there are encouraging signs that the federal government soon may begin funding research to obtain more precise information about the specific nature of the processes of classroom communication.

The information which is available clearly indicates that courses in classroom communication are expanding due to their popularity with students; however, there is currently scant evidence of the effect such courses may be having upon subsequent teaching performance in classrooms. There is even less information regarding the relationships between the initial characteristics of enrollees and course outcomes. Despite lack of funds and other significant constraints prohibiting such research, some kind of initial research effort would be helpful if it aimed at evaluating the long-range impact of such study upon subsequent interactions in classrooms. At the same time, survey research would be particularly useful in demonstrating to local state, or federal officials the extent to which practicing teachers need instruction in the theory and skills of classroom communication. Through random sampling methods, state-wide or county-wide surveys might help determine (1) the level of knowledge about and

sophistication in communication which can be assumed of practicing non-speech teachers, (2) their utilization of communication skills, (3) their perception of the most common communicative problems they encounter, and/or (4) the degree to which they recognize children's needs for greater skill in and understanding of the processes of speech communication.

On the basis of the information reported in the preceding pages, courses in classroom communication appear to be economically feasible, despite current economic cutbacks throughout higher education. Practicing teachers are eagerly paying to take such courses; and, if sought, outside funding appears available through a wide variety of sources. The major financial obstacles appear to be (1) obtaining the seed money needed to initiate such courses, (2) expanding courses where student demand or need is particularly great, (3) taking such courses on the road to make them more widely available to teachers, and (4) providing for instructors' time and travel to allow observations of enrolled students' classrooms.

Finally, to overcome the obstacles that might seem inherent in the development of interdisciplinary instruction, the following suggestions are offered.

1. While many speech communication respondents to Lynn's survey expressed difficulty in establishing courses through academic educational units regulating courses in education, other departments experienced success working through continuing education offices (e.g., Penn State). Schools introducing new courses--especially team-taught ones—might consider the advantages of offering courses under the aegis of a similarly "neutral" administrative authority rather than within the respective jurisdictions of education or speech communication departments.
2. Non-speech instructors of such courses appear to lack adequate training in speech communication which such a course should require, but they appear to have a definite advantage in terms of pre-college teaching experience. Speech communication instructors of such courses, on the other hand, may lack such extensive pre-college teaching experience, but they have far more extensive knowledge of the theory and skills related to classroom communication. Institutions planning to introduce such courses might therefore consider the merits of jointly taught courses, drawing upon the best-qualified faculty members from the speech communication and education departments.
3. Instructors of such courses appear to need greater exposure to textbooks and information from each other's professional areas. For this reason, education and speech communication associations might begin to consider ways in which the interdisciplinary exchanges of ideas can be promoted, such as the possibility of

jointly held conferences. It would be helpful if authors and publishers of textbooks used in courses in classroom communication made an effort to display their books at national conventions held by the professional associations of both education and speech communication.

4. It would seem fruitful to arrange post-doctoral summer seminars for interested faculty members from any of the disciplines related to classroom communication. Such seminars could fulfill several purposes: (a) to enable participants to read more deeply in a wider variety of relevant materials and research, (b) to bring together professionals from both education and speech communication to benefit from each other's expertise, (c) to broaden their theoretical knowledge of speech communication as applied in the classroom, and (d) to initiate new research that would be firmly based on interdisciplinary understandings.

At a time when budgets at teacher-training institutions are being drastically reduced and when fewer graduates are finding jobs and fewer students are enrolling, most teacher educators are rightfully concerned about maintaining both the academic excellence of their programs and their students' standings in today's highly competitive job market. It is hoped that this publication will convince teacher educators that, in offering courses in classroom communication to improve their students' communicative competencies, the risks may be minimal and the rewards may be great.

Notes

Introduction

1. Douglas Ehninger, "Report of the Committee on the Scope of Rhetoric and the Place of Rhetorical Studies in Higher Education," in *The Prospect of Rhetoric: Report of the National Development Project* [of the SCA], ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 214.

2. *Spectra* (April 1973): 14.

3. Efforts involved in arriving at this definition are described in Elizabeth Meagher Lynn, "A National Survey of Graduate Courses in Classroom Communication Theory and Skills Available to Practicing Elementary and Secondary Teachers" [Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1974], pp. 59-63. For a listing of some of the dimensions of communication covered by this definition, see Chapter 1 ("Rationale from the Field of Speech Communication") and Chapter 2 of this report.

Chapter 1

1. George G. Stern, "Measuring Noncognitive Variables in Research on Teaching," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 398; C. Kyle Packer and T. Packer, "Cybernetics, Information Theory and the Educative Process," in *Teaching: Vantage Points for Study*, ed. Ronald T. Hyman (New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1968), p. 66; Ronald T. Hyman, "Introduction," in Hyman, *Teaching: Vantage Points*, p. 13; R. G. Martin, "Communication and the Act of Teaching: A Footnote to Models of Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education* 22 (Winter 1971): 424; and Ned A. Flanders, "Basic Skills Derived from a Model of Speaking and Listening," *Journal of Teacher Education* 24 (Spring 1973): 24. For additional sources, the reader is advised to consult Lynn, "National Survey of Courses in Classroom Communication."

2. N. L. Gage, "Paradigm for Research on Teaching," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching* [1963], p. 96; David H. Jenkins, "Characteristics and Functions of Leadership in Instructional Groups," in Hyman, *Teaching: Vantage Points*, p. 215; James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, "A Study of Openness in Classroom Interactions," in Hyman, *Teaching: Vantage Points*, p. 199; John D. McNeil and W. James Popham, "The Assessment of Teacher Competence," in *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. Robert M. W.

Florida, 1962) and Charles M. Galloway, *Teaching is Communicating: Nonverbal Language in the Classroom*, AST Bulletin 29 (Washington: Association for Student Teaching, National Education Association, 1970). In addition, the entire October 1971 issue of *Theory into Practice* was devoted to nonverbal communication in the classroom. Finally, significant implications for future research on nonverbal communication in the classroom are contained in Millard Lee Blakey, "The Relationship between Teacher Prophecy and Teacher Verbal Behavior and Their Effect upon Student Achievement" (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University College of Education, 1970).

17. Thomas Gordon, *T.E.T.: Teacher Effectiveness Training* (New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1974); and William M. Fox, "A Study of the Impact of a Course in General Semantics on the Educational-Operational Assumptions of Prospective Teachers" *Etc.* 31 (1974): 295-305.

18. Evelina Orteza y Miranda, "The Language of the Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education* 18 (Winter 1967), 477-83; and Gordon, *T.E.T.*

19. Paul A. Olson, "Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers" (University of Nebraska, January 1975), p. 22.

20. See, for instance: Smith, "Conceptual Analysis," pp. 294-98; Donald Musella, "Improving Teacher Evaluation," *Journal of Teacher Education* 20 (Spring 1970): 15-21; and Martin, "Communication and the Act of Teaching."

21. Michael J. Dunkin and Bruce J. Biddle, *The Study of Teaching* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974).

22. For compilations of educational research efforts prior to 1972, consult Ned Flanders and Graham Nuthall, eds., "The Classroom Behavior of Teachers," *International Review of Education* 18 (1972): 427-586; and Elizabeth M. Lynn and Kurt W. Ritter, eds., "Classroom Communication: A Flexible Teacher Training Program in Interpersonal Communication," ED 079 793. For post-1972 information, consult Jere E. Brophy and Thomas L. Good, *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974) and an annotated bibliography by David C. Kleiman, "Teacher-Student Interaction in the Classroom" (Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association, 1975).

23. See note 16.

24. James Hoetker and William P. Ahlbrand, Jr., "The Persistence of the Recitation: A Review of Observational Studies of Teacher Questioning Behavior" (St. Ann, Mo.: CEMREL, 1968), ED 036 511, p. 21.

25. Bryce B. Hudgins and William P. Ahlbrand, Jr., "A Study of Classroom Interaction and Thinking: Interim Report" (St. Ann, Mo.: CEMREL, 1968), ED 026 344, p. 36.

26. Ned A. Flanders, *Analyzing Teacher Behavior* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970).

27. Three basic limitations are: (1) as a descriptive tool, IA can only describe a small fragment of the communication occurring in a classroom; (2) questions persist regarding the relationships between indirect teaching (the goal of IA training) and such variables as (a) student IQ, (b) teacher personality, and (c) student and/or teacher attitude; (3) there is a long history of evidence that the overt recording of either verbal or nonverbal communication alters the communication behavior of the subject(s); consequently, all research using observational systems is affected to an unknown extent by this uncontrollable factor.

28. A. A. Bellack, H. Kliebard, R. Hyman, and F. L. Smith, *The Language of the Classroom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966).

29. W. P. Ahlbrand and W. J. Hoetker, "A Review of Observational Studies of Classroom Verbal Behavior," in W. J. Hoetker, "Analysis of the Subject-Matter Related Verbal Behavior in Nine Junior High School English Classes (doctoral diss., Washington University, 1967).

30. Helen H. Davidson and Gerhard Lang, "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior," *Journal of Experimental Education* 29 (December 1960): 107-18.

31. M. Vere DeVault, Dan W. Anderson, and Eleanore Larson, "An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Teacher Communication on Mental Health in the Classroom," in *Mental Health and Teacher Education, Forty-Sixth Yearbook, 1967* (Washington: Association for Student Teaching, 1967), ED 031 417, p. 213.

32. Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, "Analyzing Classroom Interaction: A More Powerful Alternative" [1969], ED 041 837, p. 5.

33. M. Silberman, "Behavioral Expression of Teachers' Attitudes toward Elementary School Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 60 (1969): 402-407.

34. Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, "Behavioral Expression of Teacher Attitudes," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 63 (1972): 617-24.

35. Robert D. Hess and Ruby Takanishi, "The Relationship of Teacher Behavior and School Characteristics to Student Engagement," Technical Report No. 42 (Palo Alto, Cal.: Stanford [University] Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1974), ED 098 225.

36. Brophy and Good, *Teacher-Student Relationships*.

37. R. G. Martin, "Communication and the Act of Teaching: A Footnote to Models of Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education* 22 (Winter 1971): 422, 418.

38. The Nebraska Curriculum Development Center stands out as an exception within the field of education. Not only does it have a tradition of developing teachers' communication skills, but it is also one of the few educational agencies concerned with preparing teachers to develop speech communication skills in their students. For reports of their ideas on speech communication instruction for all teachers, see Frank M. Rice, "The Influence of the Arts of Language Conference," *Elementary English* (March 1969); and "Oracy" (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska, 1968), ED 045 680.

39. Complaints regarding inadequate pre-college speech communication preparation have been a long-standing theme of the professional literature. For recent comments, see, e.g., James Gibson, "What Is the Relationship between the Speech Curricula of High Schools and Colleges?" Appendix B, in *Proceedings: 1973 SCA Summer Conference*, pp. 51-53.

40. For recent statements, see *Proceedings: 1973 SCA Summer Conference*.

41. In addition to the works cited in note 86, speech communication sources stressing the reciprocal, interdependent nature of teacher-student communication include Karl F. Robinson and Albert B. Becker, *Effective Speech for the Teacher* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970); Kathleen M. Galvin and Cassandra Book, *Speech Communication: An Interpersonal Approach for Teachers* (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1972); and William D. Brooks and Gustav W. Friedrich, "A Rationale for Teacher Education in Speech Communication," in *Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973).

42. While the reader may find greater theoretical depth in interpersonal communication texts unrelated to the classroom, Gerald M. Phillips, David E. Butt, and Nancy J. Metzger, *Communication in Education* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974) have interpreted these topics in terms of the teacher-student situation.

43. See note 42.

44. L. S. Harms, "Listener Judgments of Status Cues in Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 47 (1961): 164-68; Robert N. Bostrom, "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," *Speech Teacher* 13 (November 1964): 283-87; Frederick Williams, "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding 'Disadvantaged,' " *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 13 (September 1970): 472-88; Gerald M. Phillips, et. al., "Communication and the New Society," in *The Development of Oral Communication in the Classroom* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970), pp. 157-99; Rita C. Naremore, "Teachers' Judgments of Children's Speech: A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes," *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 17-27; Frederick Williams, Jack L. Whitehead, and Leslie M. Miller, "Ethnic Stereotyping and Judgments of Children's Speech," *Speech Monographs* 38 (August 1971): 166-70; Frederick Williams, Jack Whitehead, and Jane Traupmann, "Teachers' Evaluations of Children's Speech," *Speech Teacher* 20 (Novem-

ber 1971): 247-54; James D. Moe, "Listener Judgments of Status Cues in Speech: A Replication and Extension," *Speech Monographs* 39 (June 1972): 144-47; Frederick Williams, "Language, Attitude, and Social Change," in *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme*, ed. Frederick Williams (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970); Jerry D. Feezel, "Implications of Speech Communication Research," in *New Horizons for Teacher Education in Speech Communication: Report of the Memphis Conference of Teacher Educators*, ed. P. Judson Newcombe and R. R. Allen (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook, 1974), pp. 51-64.

45. See, for example, Galvin and Book, *Speech Communication*, pp. 86-96; Phillips, et al., "Building the Communication Atmosphere in the Classroom," in *Communication in Education*, pp. 187-208; Margaret Clark, Ella Erway, and Lee Beltzer, *The Learning Encounter: The Classroom as a Communications Workshop* (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 52-65; Brooks and Friedrich, "Metacommunication in the Classroom," in *Teaching Speech Communication*, pp. 156-71. In addition, Marjorie W. Hesler, "An Investigation of Instructor Use of Space," (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1972), contains a good review of related literature.

46. Units on semantics are found in most general speech and interpersonal communication texts used at the college level. Recommendations have most commonly appeared in conference reports such as the SCA Conference Reports cited elsewhere in these notes.

47. Speech communication scholars have written extensively on the ramifications of sociolinguistics in the classroom. Among the many outstanding sources are: Williams, *Language and Poverty*; Clark, et al., "A Dialect for Meaning," in *Learning Encounter*, pp. 157-83; Grace Sims Holt, "Speech Communication for the Black American," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 54 (December 1970): 100-107; Frederick Williams and Rita C. Naremore, "On the Functional Analysis of Social Class Differences in Modes of Speech," *Speech Monographs* 36 (June 1969): 77-102; Barbara S. Wood and Julia Curry, "Everyday Talk and School Talk of the City Black Child," *Speech Teacher* 18 (November 1969): 282-96; Grace S. Holt, "The Ethno-Linguistic Approach to Speech-Language Learning," *Speech Teacher* 19 (March 1970): 98-100; Walt Wolfram, "Sociolinguistic Premises and the Nature of Nonstandard Dialects," *Speech Teacher* 19 (September 1970): 177-84; Frederick Williams and Barbara Wood, "Negro Children's Speech: Some Social Class Differences in Word Predictability," *Language and Speech* (1970): 141-50; Richard R. Lee, "Linguistics, Communication and Behavioral Objectives: A Remedial Curriculum," *Speech Teacher* 20 (January 1971): 1-9; Frederick Williams and Edward E. Rundell, "Teaching Teachers to Comprehend Negro Nonstandard English," *Speech Teacher* 20 (September 1971): 174-77; Dennis R. Preston, "Social Dialects and College English," *Speech Teacher* 20 (November 1971): 237-46; Thomas S. Frentz, "Children's Comprehension of Standard and Negro Nonstandard English Sentences," *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 10-16; Richard L. Conville and Richard W. Story, "Teaching to Communicate: The Sociolinguistic Problem," *Speech Teacher* 21 (November 1972): 247-54; "Speech Communication for Minority Students: A Symposium," *Speech Teacher* 21 (November 1972): 247-54; Robert Hepper and Rita C. Naremore, *Children's Speech* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 114-26; Dorothy C. Higginbotham, "Implications of Linguistic Theory and Research," in *New Horizons*, ed. Newcombe and Allen, pp. 12-35.

48. See, for example, Haig A. Bosmajian, "The Language of White Racism," *College English* 31 (December 1969): 263-72; H. A. Bosmajian, "The Language of Sexism," *Etc.* 29 (September 1972): 305-312; and Jo Sprague, "The Reduction of Sexism in Speech Communication Education," *Speech Teacher* 24 (January 1975): 37-45.

49. See, for example, Mardel Ogilvie, "Affective Objectives and Teacher Education," in *New Horizons*, pp. 97-111.

50. Recommendations have generally appeared only in conference reports.

51. Guides for the teacher who is not a speech pathology specialist can be found in numerous texts, including John W. Black, "On Improving the Speech of Children," in *On*

Teaching Speech in Elementary and Junior High Schools, ed. by J. J. Auer and E. B. Jenkinson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 63-89; Alan W. Huckleberry and E. S. Strother, "Speech Correction and the Classroom Teacher," in *Speech Education for the Elementary Teacher*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), pp. 249-359; Loren Reid, "Improving Voice, Articulation, and Other Elements of Language," in *Teaching Speech*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 131-53; Phillips, et al., "Speech and Hearing Defects in the Classroom," in *Development of Oral Communication*, pp. 113-28; David E. Yoder, "Some Viewpoints of the Speech, Hearing and Language Clinician," in *Language and Poverty*, ed. Frederick Williams, pp. 400-15; Francine L. Merritt and Claude L. Shaver, "Teaching Voice and Diction," in *Speech Methods and Resources*, 2nd ed., ed. W. W. Braden (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 283-304; C. C. Brong and S. I. Gilmore, "Understanding Students with Speech and Hearing Disorders," in *Speech Methods and Resources*, pp. 347-65; C. C. Brong and S. I. Gilmore, "Helping Students with Speech and Hearing Disorders," in *Speech Methods and Resources*, pp. 366-86. Additionally, increasing attention is being paid in speech communication writings to psychological problems which may be reflected in speech communication behaviors. Sample authors would include: Gerald M. Phillips, "The Problem of Reticence" [1965], in *Dimensions of Oral Communication Instruction*, ed. Keith Erickson (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1970), pp. 327-45; Phillips, et al., "The Quiet and the Noisy Ones," in *Development of Oral Communication*, pp. 129-56; Phillips, et al., "The Clinical Responsibility of the Speech Teacher: The Personal Quality of Communication," in *Communication in Education*, pp. 162-84; and Ian Fisher, "When Children's Speech Deteriorates," *Speech Teacher* 20 (September 1971): 199-202.

52. Among the numerous speech communication education books in the area of children's language development, see: Phillips, et al., *Development of Oral Communication*; Dorothy Higginbotham, "On the Total Elementary School Speech Program," in *On Teaching Speech in Elementary*, ed. Auer and Jenkinson; Phillips, et al., "Child Language Development," in *Communication in Education*, pp. 57-87; Huckleberry and Strother, *Speech Education*; Hopper and Naremore, *Children's Speech*; Beverly L. Hendricks, "The Move to Power: A Philosophy of Elementary Speech Education," *Speech Teacher* 19 (September 1970): 151-60; Robert W. Hopper, "Expanding the Notion of Competence: Implications for Elementary School Programs," *Speech Teacher* 20 (January 1971): 29-35; and Robert Hopper, "Communicative Development and Children's Responses to Questions," *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 1-9.

53. John F. Sisco, "Interpersonal Small-Group Communication," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 54 (December 1970): 77-85; Owen Peterson, "Teaching Discussion," in *Speech Methods and Resources*, 2nd ed., ed. W. W. Braden, pp. 54-73; Reid, "Group Discussion," in *Teaching Speech*, pp. 189-216; George L. Lewis, et al., "Conversation, Discussion, and Debate," in *Teaching Speech* (Columbus: Chas. E. Merrill, 1969), pp. 353-415; R. R. Allen and S. C. Willmington, "The Study of Interpersonal and Public Communication," in *Speech Communication in the Secondary School* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), pp. 21-39; Huckleberry and Strother, "Discussion," in *Speech Education*, pp. 222-45; Galvin and Book, "Group Communication," in *Speech Communication*, pp. 59-75; and Hopper and Naremore, "Teaching Communication to Children," in *Children's Speech*, pp. 97-113.

54. Karl R. Wallace, ed., *History of Speech Education in America* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954); Lynn, "National Survey of Courses in Classroom Communication"; and Roy Gene Anderson, "A Study of the Basic Speech-Communication Course Designed Primarily for Classroom Teachers" (Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, 1970).

55. G. M. Phillips, "The Oral Communication Revolution," pp. 257-58.

56. *Ibid.*, pp. 262-70.

57. Based upon a recommendation presented at this [1968] conference, the members of the Speech Association of America supported a mandate to change the association name to Speech Communication Association in 1970.

58. A study sponsored by the SCA and directed by R. R. Allen (University of Wisconsin, Madison) to identify functional communication competencies in children and youth is in press at this writing. See note 3 to chapter 3.

59. Robert J. Kibler and Larry L. Barker, eds., *Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication: Report of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development* (New York: Speech Association of America, 1969), p. 18.

60. Ehninger, "Report on the Scope of Rhetoric," in *Prospect of Rhetoric*, pp. 211-14.

61. *Ibid.*, p. 216.

62. Karl R. Wallace, "Remarks on the Speech Education Conference," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI: Implications of Recent Research for Speech Communication Education*, ed. Malcolm O. Sillars (New York: Speech Communication Association, 1970), p. 133.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 132.

64. Barbara Sundene Wood, "The Implications of Recent Research in Child Communication Development for Speech Communication Education," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, pp. 20-21.

65. Kenneth L. Brown, "Implications of Communication Theory for Speech Communication in the Elementary School: A Response," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 141. For additional ideas on the communication self-model a teacher should provide, see Donald H. Ecroyd, "The Relevance of Oral Language Development to Classroom Teaching," *Today's Speech* 21 (Winter 1973): 11-17.

66. Wood, "Implications of Research in Child Communication Development," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, pp. 20-21.

67. Frederick Williams, "Implications of Recent Research in Social Dialects for Speech Communication Education," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 35.

68. Gerald R. Miller, "Communication Theory and Speech Communication Education: Outlook for the 70's," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, pp. 39-48.

69. Donald H. Ecroyd, "Implications of the Four Principal Papers for the Teaching of Rhetoric in the Elementary School," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 122.

70. Williams, "Implications of Research in Social Dialects," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 35.

71. Ecroyd, "Implications for Teaching Rhetoric," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 123.

72. Wallace, "Remarks," in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference VI*, p. 135.

73. Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, "Group Three: Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers," in *Proceedings: 1973 SCA Summer Conference*, p. 21.

74. Guidelines of this nature have recently been published by the SCA (1975) and are referred to later in this report. A report by L. E. Sarbaugh, included in these 1973 conference papers, outlines a pilot competency-based program for speech communication teachers at Michigan State University. While much of the learning would require the in-depth focus of a speech communication major, some of the other listed competencies might well be part of every teacher's preparation (e.g., identifying means of overcoming communication barriers). "Appendix A: Guidelines for Performance of Students Majoring in Speech Communication: A Pilot Program for Teacher Training (1972)," in *Proceedings: 1973 SCA Summer Conference*, pp. 30-38.

75. Lieb-Brilhart, "Implications of University Reorganization," in *Proceedings: 1973 SCA Summer Conference*, p. 17.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

77. Gustav W. Friedrich, "Group One: Competency-Based Teacher Education," in *Proceedings: 1973 Summer Conference*, p. 12.

78. Edward J. Pappas, "Group Two: Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula," in *Proceedings: 1973 Summer Conference*, p. 14.

79. Recommendation S-6, "Recommendations Emerging from Special-Interest Caucuses," in *New Horizons*, ed. Newcombe and Allen, pp. 157-58.

80. Recommendation R 6.1, in *New Horizons*, p. 136.

81. Recommendation P 3.1, in *New Horizons*, p. 139.

82. Donald H. Ecroyd, "Implications of the Memphis Conference for Elementary Speech Communication Education," in *New Horizons*, pp. 162-63.

83. Nemi C. Jain, "Intercultural Communication Needs of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the Conference on Intercultural Communication and Teacher Education* (Milwaukee, Wis.: Milwaukee Urban Observatory, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1975), p. 27.

84. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

85. Joint Task Force of the Speech Communication Association and the American Theatre Association, "Guidelines for Speech Communication and Theatre Programs in Teacher Education," *Speech Teacher* 24 (November 1975): 343-64.

86. See, for instance: Gerald M. Phillips, Robert E. Dunham, Robert Brubaker, and David Butt, *The Development of Oral Communication in the Classroom* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970); Margaret Clark, Ella Erway, and Lee Beltzer, *The Learning Encounter: The Classroom as a Communications Workshop* (New York: Random House, 1971); Deems M. Brooks, ed., *Speech Communication Instruction: A Reader* (New York: David McKay, 1972); Gerald M. Phillips, David E. Butt, and Nancy J. Metzger, *Communication in Education: A Rhetoric of Schooling and Learning* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974); and Gustav Friedrich, Kathleen Galvin, and Cassandra Book, *Classroom Communication: Context, Roles, and Processes* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, forthcoming).

87. Anderson's dissertation is discussed at length in the next chapter. For other sources, see Introduction note 3 and Chapter 1 notes 44, 62, and 73.

88. Betty J. Haslett, "Dimensions of Student Evaluation of Instruction in Performance and Nonperformance Courses," unpublished study.

89. Betty J. Haslett, "Attitudes toward Teachers as a Function of Student Academic Self-Concept," *Research in Higher Education* (Winter 1975).

90. Betty J. Haslett, "Influence of Student Ability and Sex on Students' Attitudes toward Teachers," *Education* (Winter 1975).

91. *Ibid.*

92. Harry E. Munn and Kim Giffin, "Relationships between Teachers' Task-Oriented Behavior, Interpersonal Maintenance Behavior, Student Achievement, and Student Satisfaction," *Speech Teacher* 22 (November 1973): 304-309.

93. James W. Gibson and John A. Kline, "Computer Analysis of Verbal Behavior in the Classroom," *Speech Teacher* 22 (January 1973): 58-63.

94. John Miller and Cal Hylton, "Teacher-Student Communication Patterns," *Western Speech* 38 (Summer 1974): 146-56.

95. Churchill L. Roberts and Samuel L. Becker, "Communication and Teaching Effectiveness—A Quantitative Study of Verbal and Nonverbal Communication in Vocational Education Programs in the State of Florida. Final Report," (University of West Florida, Florida State Dept. of Education, 1973), ED 096 708.

96. Extensive research on reticence has been conducted at Pennsylvania State University. For a recent sample, see Gerald M. Phillips and Nancy J. Metzger, "The Reticent Syndrome: Some Theoretical Considerations about Etiology and Treatment," *Speech Monographs* 40 (August 1973): 220-30. See also Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Kenneth D. Frandsen, "The 'Other' Speech Student: An Empirical Analysis of Some Interpersonal Relations Orientations of the Reticent Student," *Speech Teacher* 21 (November 1972): 296-302.

97. Edward J. McGlone and Loren Anderson, "The Dimensions of Teacher Credibility," *Speech Teacher* 22 (September 1973): 196-200; and James C. McCroskey, William E. Holdridge, and J. Kevin Toomb, "An Instrument for Measuring the Source Credibility of Basic Speech Communication Instructors," *Speech Teacher* 23 (January 1974): 26-33.

98. See, for example, Stephen Young, "Student Perceptions of Helpfulness in Classroom Speech Criticism," *Speech Teacher* 23 (September 1974): 222-34.

99. See, for example, Rita C. Naremore, "Teachers' Judgments of Children's Speech:

A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes," *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 17-27; Frederick Williams and Edward E. Rundell, "Teaching Teachers to Comprehend Negro Nonstandard English," *Speech Teacher* 20 (September 1971): 174-77; and Frederick Williams, Jack L. Whitehead, and Jane Traupmann, "Teachers' Evaluations of Children's Speech," *Speech Teacher* 20 (November 1971): 247-54.

100. Don M. Boileau, "An Investigation of the Effects of a Persuasive Speech: An Application of Piaget's Developmental Theory," *Speech Teacher* 24 (January 1975): 1-14.

101. Douglas J. Pedersen, "The Teacher Workshop Program at Penn State," *Today's Speech* 20 (Fall 1972): 55-58; Virginia P. Richmond and John A. Daly, "Extension Education: An Almost Inexhaustible Job Market for Communication Graduates," *Bulletin of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication*, No. 11 (January 1975): 6-8.

102. Wayne C. Minnick, "The Status of Speech, 1967" (Presidential address delivered at the Illinois Speech Association Convention, Peoria, Ill., November 1967), p. 1 of speech manuscript. To put his comments in historical context, see Herold Lillywhite, "Speech Needs of Teachers," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32 (December 1946): 498; and Donald Kenneth Orban, "A Survey of Speech Education in the Public Senior High Schools of the United States, 1969-70" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1973), p. 20.

103. Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, ed., "Education Notes," *Spectra* 11 (October 1975): 11.

104. For sample complaints regarding these common assumptions of educators, refer to Preston H. Scott, "Speech Training for Teachers," *Southern Speech Journal* 8 (November 1942): 34-35; and G. M. Phillips, "The Oral Communication Revolution," *Pennsylvania School Journal* (April 1968), reprinted in Keith Erickson, ed., *Dimensions of Oral Communication Instruction* (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1970). For information on the oral shortcomings of language arts programs, see Kenneth L. Brown, "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks: Part I," *Elementary English* 44 (1967): 330-41; Part II, *Elementary English* 44 (1967): 461-65, 467; and Kenneth L. Brown, "Speech Communication and the Language Arts," *Today's Speech* 20 (Fall 1972): 25-31.

105. Orban, "Speech in the Public Senior High Schools," p. 151. For an historical review of educators' attitudes, see in addition: "Speech Education in Teacher-Training Institutions: Report of the Committee on Speech Education in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 16 (February 1930): 45; "Speech in Teacher Education: Committee on Teacher Education," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32 (February 1946): 80, 92; Paul Walwick, "The Status of Speech Instruction in the Elementary Schools" (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1967).

106. Cf. (in chronological order) Walwick, *op. cit.*; Helen Coe Mackenzie Strain, "A Survey of Speech Education in Secondary Schools of Indiana," (M.A. thesis, Indiana University, 1967); Orban, *op. cit.*; Richard B. Lee, "A Diffusion Strategy for Secondary Speech Communication" (Appendix C), in *Proceedings: SCA Summer Conference IX: Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication*, ed. Robert C. Jeffrey and William Work (SCA, 1973), p. 87; Susan D. Carrel and Charles R. Petrie, "The Status of Speech Education in New York Senior High Schools, 1972-73," *Today's Speech* 22 (Spring 1974): 39-50; and Robert Ince, "Implications of Previous SCA Conferences," in *New Horizons for Teacher Education in Speech Communication*, ed. P. Judson Newcombe and R. R. Allen (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co. and SCA, 1974), pp. 67-68.

107. Allen A. Schmeider, "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education," *PBTE* 3 (November 1974).

108. Alabama and Mississippi require a speech course of all elementary and secondary teachers; Louisiana and South Dakota require a speech course for elementary teachers only. Elizabeth H. Woellner, *Requirements for Certification: For Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges*, 40th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

109. Kansas (elementary) and Oklahoma (grades 7-12), *ibid.*

110. Vermont and South Carolina, *ibid.*

111. According to information provided in *ibid.*

112. Anderson, "A Study of the Basic Speech-Communication Course," pp. 47, 94.

113. Woellner, *Requirements for Certification.*

114. "Appendix C: Minnesota Human Relations Requirement for Teacher Certification," in *Proceedings: Conference on Intercultural Communication*, ed. Jain and Cummings, p. 135. For further information on the development of teacher education programs to meet the Minnesota certification requirement, see Warren F. Shaffer, "Human Relations Programs I and II: Technical Reports" (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Psycho-Educational Center, 1974), ED 095 451 and 095 452.

115. "Appendix D: Wisconsin Human Relations Requirement for Teacher Certification," in *Proceedings: Conference on Intercultural Communication*, ed. Jain and Cummings, pp. 136-37.

116. "Preface," in *Panel Summaries from the National Conference on Studies in Teaching* (National Institute of Education, DHEW, 1974, Conference held June 16-20, 1974 at Dulles International Airport).

117. *Ibid.*

118. "Panel 2 Summary: Teaching as Human Interaction," in *Panel Summaries*, pp. 1-16.

119. "Panel 5 Summary: Teaching as a Linguistic Process in a Cultural Setting," in *Panel Summaries*, pp. 1-7.

Chapter 2

1. Roy Gene Anderson, "A Study of the Basic Speech-Communication Course Designed Primarily for Classroom Teachers" (Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, 1970), pp. 47, 94.

2. Elizabeth Meagher Lynn, "A National Survey of Graduate Courses in Classroom Communication Theory and Skills Available to Practicing Elementary and Secondary Teachers" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1974), pp. 288-91.

3. Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, *Looking in Classrooms* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973); Jere E. Brophy and Thomas L. Good, *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974); and Arthur Kraft, *The Living Classroom: Putting Humanistic Education into Practice* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975).

4. See notes 1 and 2 above.

5. Anderson chose to consider only institutions accredited by the NCATE because information from the American Council on Education indicated that 70 percent of all teachers are trained in NCATE-accredited institutions, and because Anderson found, in a preliminary investigation, that "a significantly greater percentage of the accredited institutions offered a basic speech-communication course designed for teachers" (Anderson, p. 33).

6. The Western region includes: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. The Southern region includes: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The Central region includes: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wisconsin. The Eastern region includes: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia.

7. Anderson also categorized responses according to the size of the institutional enrollment, by type of institution ("teacher preparatory, liberal arts" or "other"), and by type of financial control (public or private).

8. Anderson, pp. 37-38.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
11. Lynn, p. 66.
12. Lynn, "Defining 'Classroom Communication,'" in diss., pp. 59-63. At the same time, Lynn learned that the course title, "Communication for the Teacher," would also suggest teachers' communication needs beyond the classroom (e.g., teacher-parent discussions, professional speaking, union negotiations, communication with colleagues, etc.).
13. Immediately preceding this sentence, the letters to administrators read: "... while some colleges offer such a course through their school of education, many colleges offer graduate level courses dealing with classroom communication through speech, psychology, sociology(or continuing education departments" (Lynn, p. 273).
14. Lynn, p. 71.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
16. Anderson, p. 53; Lynn, p. 102.
17. Anderson, p. 94.
18. Education responses from Indiana University and West Virginia University showed no awareness of the graduate courses for teachers offered through speech communication departments at those respective universities. Several other incongruities in responses suggested to Lynn that a major problem within institutions is the lack of almost any contact between education and speech communication departments.
19. Lynn, pp. 80, 292-96.
20. While both conclusions are justified by the study's findings, the latter is also supported by the fact that an additional thirty-seven responses describing education courses were eliminated from the study during the early screening. In many of these responses, instructors indicated that the primary focus of their course was upon "classroom communication" as defined in the study, even though they simultaneously admitted to spending less than half of their instructional time on the study's eighteen dimensions of classroom communication. It appears t, non-speech faculty may believe that they are competently covering all that is essential about classroom communication—continuing the notion, common at other educational levels, that communication is not a subject of substantive nature and anyone with good sense can adequately cover the little that needs to be explained.
21. Anderson, p. 65; Lynn, 120.
22. Lynn found two courses in their first year of operation; all other courses had been in existence a full year or more. Note also that seven of Anderson's respondents did not report this information.
23. Anderson, pp. 64, 66.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
25. Lynn, p. 120.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
27. Anderson, pp. 242, 260.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 244-45.
35. Anderson, p. 247; Lynn, p. 100.
36. Lynn, p. 118 and Chapter 6.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 136-37.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 188-90.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 123.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 125-37.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 138.
45. Anderson, pp. 110-11.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 263.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 249-50.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
49. For an explanation of the methodology used to obtain a definition of "classroom communication" and the eighteen dimensions used in the study in defining "classroom communication," see Lynn, pp. 59-63.
50. Anderson, p. 148.
51. Lynn lists titles in Appendix M, pp. 302-306.
52. The information for this section of the report was excerpted from Anderson's dissertation, pp. 158-73, and from Lynn's dissertation, pp. 138-50.
53. Anderson, pp. 203, 207.
54. *Ibid.*; Lynn, pp. 153, 154.
55. However, Anderson reported that 55 percent of the schools in his survey did not seem to require any special requirements for teachers of such courses. Anderson, p. 216.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 211-12.
57. Lynn, pp. 162-63.
58. Anderson, p. 209; Lynn, p. 156.
59. Lynn, p. 167.
60. Lynn, pp. 241, 257.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
62. Anderson, p. 213.
63. Lynn, p. 164.
64. Anderson, pp. 220-24; Lynn, pp. 171-74.
65. Anderson, pp. 227-30; Lynn, Appendixes P and Q.
66. "A Is for Acting," Newsweek (March 8, 1976): 58.
67. *Speech Communication Directory, 1973-74* (New York: Speech Communication Association, 1973).
68. Virginia P. Richmond and John A. Daly, "Extension Education: An Almost Inexhaustible Job Market for Communication Graduates," *Bulletin of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication*, Issue 11 (January 1975): 6-8.
69. The information on the Teacher Workshop Program was obtained primarily from Douglas J. Pedersen, "A Special Report: The Teacher Workshop Program at Penn State," *Today's Speech* 20 (Fall 1972): 55-57; from participation in a nine-hour "short-course" at the 1973 SCA Convention in New York City: "Managing Instructional Programs for Non-Speech Teachers," conducted by members of the Penn State TWP and covering their work; and from personal correspondence and conversations with Dr. Douglas Pedersen. For additional information, see the Lynn dissertation.
70. The information on the graduate degree programs at Western Connecticut State College was obtained primarily from brochures describing these programs, and from personal correspondence and conversations with Dr. Robert Wolsch. For additional information, see the Lynn dissertation.
71. Information for this summary was obtained through brochures describing the 1974 and 1975 Institutes, and through questionnaires for the Lynn survey completed by Fordham faculty members.
72. The information on the "Communication in Education" workshops was obtained primarily from brochures and descriptive literature for the February and May 1974 workshops distributed at the 1974 Conference for Directors of the Basic Course, Boulder, Colorado, and from personal correspondence from Dr. Gregory Kunesh. For additional information, see the Lynn dissertation.

73. Press release, July 29, 1975, New Jersey Educational Association, 180 West State St., Trenton, New Jersey 08608.

Chapter 3

1. Joint Task Force of the Speech Communication Association and the American Theatre Association, "Guidelines for Speech Communication and Theatre Programs in Teacher Education," *Speech Teacher* 24 (November 1975): 343-64.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

3. R. R. Allen and Kenneth L. Brown, eds., *Communication Competence in Children: A Developmental Perspective* (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976).

4. Richard E. Hartzell, William A. Anthony, and Harold J. Wain, "Comparative Effectiveness of Human Relations Training for Elementary Student Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research* 66 (July-August 1973): 457-61.

5. See, for example, Robert F. Neuhard, Jr., "An In-Service Program for Cooperating Teachers and Its Effect on Student Teachers' and Cooperating Teachers' Verbal Behavior" (Ed.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1970); Janice Lee Wickless, "Effects of an In-Service Program for Teachers on Pupils' Questioning Behavior in Science Classes" (Ed.D. diss., Columbia University, Teachers College, 1971); and Elizabeth Bouey Yates, "Changing Attitudes and Behavior: Guidelines for the In-Service Education of Social Studies Teachers in the Secondary Schools of the District of Columbia" (Ed.D. diss., George Washington University, 1969).

6. Beverly L. Lusty and Barbara Sundene Wood, "Effects of an NDEA Institute Upon Attitudes of Inner-City Elementary Teachers," *Speech Teacher* 18 (September 1969): 217-22; Ronald Joseph Marino, "The Effects of a Concentrated In-Service Program Designed to Improve Elementary Teachers' Attitudes toward Children" (Ph.D. diss., Michigan State University, 1971).

7. Warren Chester Coffey, "Change in Teachers' Verbal Classroom Behavior Resulting from an In-Service Program in Science Education" (Ed.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1967).

8. Roy A. Edelfelt, "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," *Journal of Teacher Education* 25 (Fall 1974): 251.

9. Hugh G. Petri, "Do You See What I See? The Epistemology of Interdisciplinary Inquiry," *Educational Researcher* 5 (February 1976): 9-15.

Resources

by David C. Kleiman

As the preceding chapters have indicated, educators have become increasingly concerned during the past decade with the complexities of teacher-student communication in the elementary and secondary classroom. Courses have been developed at a rapid rate to meet the classroom teacher's needs. However, with no channels for contacting other professionals working in the same area, course developers have had little assistance in their work.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide some aid. In order to be of maximum assistance to developers of courses in classroom communication, resources have been identified which might help in planning, establishing priorities, developing additional courses, or constructing student reading guides, both for practicing teachers as well as teachers in training. The resources selected for this chapter include journal articles, texts, bibliographies, ERIC documents, games, and exercises completed during the past decade. All resources have been annotated to facilitate the developer's work. Readers should note that important items completed prior to 1965 can usually be found in the bibliographies and collected works cited in the listings. In addition, those who use the resources should be sensitive to the different levels of the materials and should consider items which are appropriate to the needs, experiences, and prior speech communication education of teachers with whom they work. Finally, the citations are selective rather than exhaustive; therefore, readers are encouraged to consult current journals and the ERIC system as continuing sources of information.

A central criterion governing the selection of materials was the

extent to which they focused on teacher-student interaction in the elementary and/or secondary classroom. Thus, for example, a citation which considered nonverbal behavior in the classroom was selected over a more general work on nonverbal communication. Generally, only materials which focus on classroom communication have been included. Teachers concerned with speech communication instruction beyond that scope may want to consult works which deal in a more general way with the complexities of communication behavior. Such items may in part be adapted by the teacher educator for classroom use. The following list includes items that may be consulted for that purpose.

General Communication and Interpersonal Communication

Barbour, Alton, and Alvin Goldberg. *Interpersonal Communication: Teaching Strategies and Resources*. Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS Speech Communication Module, Speech Communication Association, 1974.

Berlo, David. *The Process of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Brooks, William. *Speech Communication*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1971.

Hart, Roderick P., and Don M. Burks. "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction." *Speech Monographs* 39 (June 1972): 75–91.

Kelter, John. *Interpersonal Speech Communication: Elements and Structures*. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1970.

Patton, Bobby R., and Kim Giffin. *Interpersonal Communication: Basic Text and Readings*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Sereno, Kenneth, and David C. Mortensen, eds. *Foundations of Communication Theory*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Stewart, John, ed. *Bridges Not Walls: A Book about Interpersonal Communication*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Oral Interpretation

Bacon, Wallace. *The Art of Interpretation*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Lee, Charlotte. *Oral Interpretation*. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971.

Public Communication

Monroe, Allan H., and Douglas Ehninger. *Principles and Types of Speech Communication*. 7th ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974.

Walter, Otis, and Robert Scott. *Thinking and Speaking*. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968.

Wilson, John F., and Carroll C. Arnold. *Dimensions of Public Communication*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Kan.: Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization, 1973.

Dreeban, Robert. "The School as a Workplace." In *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. Robert M. W. Travers, pp. 450-73. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1973.

Getzels, Jacob W., and James M. Lipham and Roald F. Campbell. *Educational Administration as a Social Process*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Tittle, Carol K. *Student Teaching: Attitude and Research Bases for Change in School and University*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Finally, while the resources in this chapter have included selective citations which concern improving the communicative skills of the elementary and secondary student (see category J below), readers may want to pay particular attention to two items which will be very helpful in developing communication programs K-12.

Allen, R. R., and Kenneth L. Brown. *Communication Competence in Children: A Developmental Perspective*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976.

Feezel, Jerry, Kent Brown, and Carol Valentine. *Annotated Bibliography of Print and Non-Print Resources in Speech Communication, Grades K-12*. Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS Speech Communication Module, Speech Communication Association, 1976.

Interest Categories

The annotated bibliography which follows is intended to help teacher educators identify materials which may be of particular interest. To facilitate this process, a category system has been devised which may help to identify materials applicable to the reader's needs. Symbols for the appropriate categories appear immediately preceding the annotation. The following interest categories have been utilized:

A. *Lecturing and Reading Aloud*. Considers organizing and developing effective lectures as well as improving the teacher's ability to read aloud from the printed page.
B. *Questioning*. Identifies the importance of and ways of developing appropriate questions for classroom use.
C. *Listening*. Suggests ways in which the teacher can become a better listener.
D. *Communicating Nonverbally*. Considers eye contact, facial expressions, and use of personal space, as well as improving the teacher's pitch, quality of voice, articulation and pronunciation.

E. *Utilizing Group Processes.* Focuses on the class as a group and also suggests ways in which the teacher can utilize small-group work in the class.

F. *Utilizing Interaction Analysis Systems.* Reviews the available systems for observing classroom behavior and/or discusses the results of interaction analysis in the classroom.

G. *Modifying Student and/or Teacher Behavior.* Considers the ways in which teachers and students may facilitate and restrain each others' communication.

H. *Identifying Communication Disorders.* Identifies a variety of communicative disorders among elementary and secondary students so that the teacher can make appropriate referrals.

I. *The Reticent Student.* Explains why students may be withdrawn, avoid interaction, and remain silent. Describes suggested methods for working with these students.

J. *Improving the Communication Skills of Elementary and Secondary Students.* Considers language stimulation activities, as well as materials which focus on debate, creative dramatics, and interpersonal communication.

K. *Language.* Covers the broad spectrum of language acquisition and development. Discusses language as a means by which one learns and the relationship between oral language and the other language arts.

L. *Social/Regional Dialects and Students with Cultural Differences.* Considers standard and nonstandard English as well as linguistically and or culturally different students.

M. *Sexist Language.* Suggests ways in which the teacher can reduce sexist language in the classroom.

N. *Self-Concept and Communication.* Focuses on the importance of self-image and the relationship between self-concept and how one communicates and interprets communication. Also discusses teaching strategies for promoting positive student self-concepts.

O. *Affective Language.* Considers language which deals with emotions, feelings, likes, dislikes, attitudes, and beliefs.

P. *Teacher Expectations and Teacher/Student Characteristics.* Considers expectations which influence communication as well as such individual characteristics as sex, physical attractiveness, and personality which may influence teacher-student communication.

Q. *Games, Simulations, and Exercises.* Includes items which can be used by elementary and secondary teachers in their own classrooms.

R. *General Works and Bibliographies.* Includes items of a general nature or which span a number of categories.

Aarons, Alfred C., Barbara Y. Gordon, and William A. Stewart, eds. "Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education." Special anthology issue. *Florida FL Reporter* 7 (Spring/Summer 1969): 1-149.

L. Discusses the implications of a linguistically and/or culturally pluralistic society for educational institutions.

Adams, Gerald R., and Allan S. Cohen. "Children's Physical and Interpersonal Characteristics that Effect Student-Teacher Interactions." *Journal of Experimental Education* 43 (Fall 1974): 1-5.

P. Data suggest that the physical characteristics of students influenced teacher-student interaction during the first week of school.

Adams, Lavarn B. "The Classroom Council: A Method for Improvement of Interpersonal Classroom Relationships." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling* 7 (March 1973): 244-47.

G. Provides a vehicle for improving teacher/student communication in the classroom.

Adler, Richard R., and Lawana Trout. *Creative Dramatics: A Selected Bibliography*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971. ED 058 211.

J. Important works by Siks, Ward, Way, and Spolin are identified in this annotated bibliography of forty-seven citations.

Alatis, James E., ed. *21st Annual Round Table: Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological and Sociological Aspects*. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

L. "Verbal Strategies in Multilingual Communication," and "Cognitive Development in the Bilingual Child" are among the articles in this volume.

Allen, R. R., Sharol Parish, and C. David Mortensen. *Communication: Interacting through Speech*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1974.

J. A high school text which considers interpersonal communication, the study of speech forms, and a critical analysis of public address.

Allen, R. R., Jo Sprague, and S. Clay Wilmington. *Speech Communication in the Secondary School*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

J. Considers speech communication in the secondary school and emphasizes interpersonal communication, theater, and film as well as instructional strategies which may be effectively utilized to achieve the instructor's objectives.

Alpert, Judith L. "Teacher Behavior across Ability Groups: A Consideration of the Mediation of Pygmalion Effects." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 66 (June 1974): 348-53.

P. Findings indicate that teachers' behavior may not be adversely affected by teachers' expectations.

Amidon, E. J. "The Effect upon the Behavior and Attitudes of Student Teachers of Training Cooperative Teachers and Student Teachers in the Use of Interaction Analysis as a Classroom Observational Technique." Philadelphia: Temple University, 1967. ED 021 777.

F. Student teachers who were taught interaction analysis appeared more indirect, accepting, and supportive in working with students.

Amidon, Edmund, and Michael Giammatteo. "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Teachers." *Elementary School Journal* 65 (February 1965): 283-85.

F. In part, superior teachers dominate their classroom less, use indirect verbal behavior more, and use less direction giving and criticism.

Amidon, E. J., and J. B. Hough, eds. *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

F. "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Elementary Teachers," and "Interaction Models of Critical Teaching Behaviors," are among the important articles in this collection.

Amidon, Edmund, and Anita Simon. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction." *Review of Educational Research* 35 (April 1965): 130-39.

F. An important early review of research on classroom interaction.

Amidon, Peggy. "Nonverbal Interaction Analysis: A Method of Systematically Observing and Recording Nonverbal Behavior." Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching, 1971.

D. F. A comprehensive manual which considers four dimensions of nonverbal behavior in the classroom.

Anderson, Gary J. "Effects of Classroom Social Climate on Individual Learning." *American Educational Research Journal* 7 (March 1970): 135-52.

F. The findings suggest that properties of classroom social climate do affect individual learning.

Anderson, R. Gene. "A Study of the Basic Speech Communication Course Designed Primarily for the Classroom Teacher." Ph.D. diss. University of Colorado, 1970.

R. This national survey considers the underlying assumptions upon which speech communication courses for teachers at the

undergraduate level are based and discusses the most common objectives of these courses.

Auer, J. Jeffery, and Edward B. Jenkinson, eds. *On Teaching Speech in Elementary and Junior High Schools*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.

J. Emphasizes how oral training can form a core of the elementary school program. Sample chapters include: "On Teaching Oral Reading" and "On Improving the Speech of Children."

Balzer, A. L., et al. "A Review of Research on Teacher Behavior Relating to Science Education." Washington: National Institute of Education, 1973. ED 087 638.

F. Reviews studies (1960-1971) which focus on teacher behavior in the science classroom.

Banks, Samuel. "Inquiry Techniques in Teaching a Multi-Ethnic Social Studies Curriculum." Baltimore: Baltimore City Public Schools, 1974. ED 102 074.

B, L. Utilizing the inquiry process, this manual provides teachers with a systematic program approach to ethnic studies in a K-12 social studies curriculum.

Bany, Mary A., and Lois V. Johnson. *Classroom Group Behavior*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968.

E. Focuses on how classroom groups behave and why. Examples are drawn from teachers' classroom experiences.

Barnes, Douglas. *Language, the Learner and the School*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1969.

F, K. Argues that teachers need insight into the special language they use in the classroom. James Britton contributes an essay which explores the role of student talk and learning.

Beisenherz, Paul C., and Jerry L. Tucker. "Limitations of Research in Science Teacher Questioning Behaviors." *Science Education* 58 (July-Sept. 1974): 423-29.

B. Reviews studies which consider effective teacher questioning behavior among science teachers.

Bellack, Arno, et al. *The Language of the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

F. Drawing from concepts of contemporary philosophers and psychologists, the authors describe and analyze the linguistic behavior of students and teachers.

Berscheid, Ellen, and Elaine Walster. "Beauty and the Best." *Psychology Today* 5 (March 1972): 43-46.

P. Deals with the effect of a child's appearance during early school years.

Beyer, Barry K. "What's the Matter with Inquiry Teaching?" *Social Studies Journal* 2 (February 1973): 64-70.

B. Five objections to inquiry teaching in social studies are discussed.

Blanch, Emma J. "Dramatics in the Foreign Language Classroom." Washington, D. C., 1974. ED 096 847.

J. Suggests uses of tableaus, poetry, and plays for the classroom.

Blakeslee, Sandra. "Study Rebuffs a View of Minority Learning." *New York Times* (October 15, 1975): 48.

L. Study suggests that teachers are unwittingly "killing" minority students with kindness by praising their work despite poor academic performance. Consequently, students develop unrealistic images of their achievement.

Bloom, B. S. "Thought-Processes in Lectures and Discussions." *Journal of General Education* 7 (April 1953): 160-69.

A. E. Suggests that lectures are more efficient in communicating knowledge to students.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

R. An essential work which provides a classification of intellectual abilities and skills to be achieved through education.

Blount, Nathan S., and Herbert J. Klausmeier. *Teaching in the Secondary School.* 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

A. One section of the book argues that lecturing does not afford opportunities for students to practice their communicative skills.

Bobson, Sarah. *Nonstandard Dialects: An Annotated Bibliography of ERIC References.* Washington: National Institute of Education, 1974.

L. The majority of citations deal with black English, though other dialects from Appalachia, New England, and the South are also considered.

Braden, Waldo W., ed. *Speech Methods and Resources.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

J. Discusses the field of speech communication. Identifies various resources a teacher may use in the classroom.

Bilhart, Barbara L. "Oral Communication for the Indian Student." *English Journal* 60 (May 1971): 629.

I. L. Examines specific communication problems and recommends ways of improving the intrapersonal and interpersonal communication of the Indian student.

Bronstein, Arthur J., and Beatrice F. Jacoby. *Your Speech and Voice.* New York: Random House, 1967.

D. J. Presents extensive drills and practice materials for better understanding and utilizing the characteristics of one's speech and voice.

Brooks, Deems M., ed. *Speech Communication Instruction.* New York: David McKay Co., 1972.

R. A reader that focuses on such topics as microteaching, questioning skills, and interaction in the interracial classroom.

Brooks, William D., and Gustav W. Friedrich. *Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973.

I. Identifies resource materials for teaching speech communication in the classroom. Also concerned with developing effective instructional strategies for the teacher.

Brophy, Jere E., and Thomas L. Good. *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

P. An important work which considers the differential teacher attitudes and expectations as they affect teacher-student interaction patterns.

Bryan, Tanis S. "An Observational Analysis of Classroom Behaviors of Children with Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 7 (January 1974): 26-34.

F. Presents interaction process analyses designed to record the task-oriented and social behavior of learning-disabled and normal third grade children.

Burger, Henry G. *Ethno-Pedagogy: Cross-Cultural Teaching Techniques.* Rev. ed. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1971.

L. Presents information about Mexican-Americans and Navajos in the American Southwest.

Buys, William E. *Speaking by Doing: A Speaking-Listening Text.* Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1973.

J. Presents a range of activities designed to develop the communicative skills of students. Focuses on listening, observing, reading aloud, and speaking persuasively.

Caine, Elaine, and G. Geoffrey Lindenauer. "Human Relations Training in Teacher Education." *Journal of Emotional Education* 13 (Winter 1973): 27-37.

G. O. The importance of teachers' ongoing emotional training is discussed.

Campbell, James R. "Macroanalysis: A New Development for Interaction Analysis." *Journal of Educational Research* 68 (March 1975): 261-69.

F. Macroanalysis, which orders observational data into larger units of analysis than microanalysis, is discussed.

Carin, Arthur A., and Robert B. Sund. *Developing Questioning Techniques: A Self-Concept Approach*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

B. Discusses the importance of questions, developing student questions, and writing cognitive and affective questions.

Cazden, Courtney B. *Child Language and Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

K. Language development, language differences and usage, oral language education, and methods of analyzing children's language are among the many focal points of the text.

_____. "Children's Questions: Their Forms, Functions and Roles in Education." *Young Children* 25 (March 1970): 202-20.

B. Concerned with how children learn to ask questions.

Cazden, Courtney B., ed. *Language Learning in Early Childhood Education*. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.

K. Includes essays for preschool teachers which consider such topics as the development of speech and language in children.

Cazden, Courtney B., Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, eds. *Function of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

R. Bilingualism, bidialectism, nonverbal communication and the "silent" Indian student are among the many topic areas included. Excellent bibliographies.

Chapin, Rosemary, et al. "Sex Role Stereotyping: Implications from Human Services." Washington D.C., 1973. Available from Min-

nesota Resource Center for Social Work Education, Augsburg College, 731 21st Ave. S., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404. Abstract only ED 096 188.

M. Presents materials on sex role stereotyping which can be used as a basis for inservice training. A bibliography and review of films, tapes, games, and exercises is included.

Chartier, Myron. "Simulation Games as Learning Devices: A Summary of Empirical Findings and Their Implications for the Utilization of Games in Instruction." 1973. ED 101 384.

Q. Discusses speech communication games and provides practical suggestions for facilitating simulation games that game-users may find helpful.

Chasen, Barbara. "Sex-Role Stereotyping and Prekindergarten Teachers." *Elementary School Journal* 74 (January 1974): 220-35.

M. Considers how the classroom may contribute to the stereotyping of sex roles.

Clark, Margaret, et al. *The Learning Encounter: The Classroom as a Communications Workshop*. New York: Random House, 1971.

R. Based on data drawn from actual classroom interaction, the authors view the classroom as a system, consider such topics as verbal and nonverbal behavior, and focus on students who do not speak "standard American English" in the classroom.

Clark, Thomas. "A Handbook of Short Courses in Dialect Studies for K-12 Teachers." Washington: American Dialect Society, 1974. ED 091 710.

L. Designed to help teachers use workshops to disseminate information about regional and social dialects. A bibliography as well as a list of workshop leaders and consultants is included.

Clifford, M. M., and E. Walster. "Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Teacher Expectations." *Sociology of Education* 46 (Spring 1973): 248-58.

P. The child's attractiveness was associated with the teacher's expectations about the child's intelligence, progress in school, and popularity with peers.

Coates, Thomas J., and Carl E. Thoresen. "Teacher Anxiety: A Review with Recommendations." Washington: National Institute of Education, 1974. ED 092 518.

D. G. Reviews studies of teacher stress and tension, focusing on incidence, sources, and effects of anxiety and ways of reducing it.

Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Sociology and the Classroom: Setting the

Conditions for Teacher-Student Interaction." *Review of Educational Research* 42 (Fall 1972): 441-52.

F. Examines how the development of status systems affects learning in the ongoing classroom.

Cole, Roberta, et al. "Language and Speech Improvement for Kindergarten and First Grade: A Supplementary Handbook." Tampa, Florida, n.d. ED 096 798.

J. A sixteen-unit language and speech improvement handbook which contains units on the child's developmental language characteristics, a sound development chart, and a general outline of daily goals and activities.

Colvario, Mary. "The Development of Classroom Workshops in Oral Communication." *English Journal* 63 (December 1974): 55-61.

G, J. Workshops can help students become more active in their classes.

Combs, Arthur W., et al. *Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

R. One central question which the authors pose is, What ideas about human behavior have special value for understanding the helping relationship?

Conference on College Composition and Communication [of NCTE]. *Students' Right to Their Own Language*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

N. Raises such questions as "What is dialect?" "How do dialects differ?" and "Does dialect limit one's ability to think?"

Cooper, Harris M., Reuben M. Baron, and Charles Lowe. "The Importance of Race and Social Class Information in the Formation of Expectancies about Academic Performance." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67 (April 1975): 312-19.

P. Results suggest that middle class students are expected to receive higher grades than lower class students.

Costello, Marjorie, F. "The Valuing Process in the Classroom: The Role of the English Teacher in Facilitating Student Growth in the Valuing Process." Ed.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, 1974. ED 099 863.

O. Examines the role of the teacher as a communicator and facilitator of the valuing process.

Craig, William N., and James L. Collins. "Communication Patterns in Classes for Deaf Students." Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1969. ED 034 367.

F. In more advanced classes, researchers found a gradual increase in student response and initiation.

Crim, Roger D. "The Use of Videotape Recorders in Teacher Self-Evaluation." Washington, D. C., 1974. ED 106 270.

F. G. Considers the need for self-evaluation and the use of videotape in providing an objective record for evaluation.

Crist, Janet. "Group Dynamics and the Teacher-Student Relationship: A Review of Recent Innovations." Palo Alto, Cal.: Stanford University, 1972. ED 062 292.

E. Focuses on innovations in the application of group processes to educational settings. Good list of references.

Cunningham, William G. "The Impact of Student-Teacher Pairings on Teacher Effectiveness." *American Educational Research Journal* 12 (Spring 1975): 169-89.

G. This study tests the hypothesis that types of students tend to differ in the benefit they receive from various types of teachers.

Davis, Jean. "Coping with Disruptive Behavior." Washington: National Education Association, 1974. ED 096 256.

G. Examines five methods for handling disruptive behavior. A variety of examples are used. A useful bibliography is included.

Dawson, Karen E., and Steven R. Forness. "Effect of Video Feedback on Teacher Behavior." *Journal of Educational Research* 68 (January 1975): 197-201.

G. Results suggest that teachers' behavior can be changed through utilization of video feedback.

Dedmon, Donald N. "Lecturing as Oral Communication." *Central States Speech Journal* 19 (Fall 1968): 188-95.

A. Criticizes the lecture method for its speaker centeredness. Suggestions for more effective lecturing are discussed.

Deethardt, John F. "The Use of Questions in the Speech-Communication Classroom." *Speech Teacher* 23 (January 1974): 15-20.

B. Considers the lack of research on the use of questions in the field of speech communication. Contains a number of useful references for those interested in developing their expertise in utilizing questions in the classroom.

Dunkin, Michael J., and Bruce J. Biddle. *The Study of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

R. Focuses on the following facets of research on classroom teaching: methodological problems, the classroom as a social system, and recommendations for researchers.

Eachus, Herbert T. "In-Service Training of Teachers as Behavior Modifiers: Review and Analysis." Washington: Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, 1971. ED 083 145.

G. Identifies basic principles of operant and classical conditioning and discusses applications for inservice training of teachers.

Ecroyd, Don. *Speech in the Classroom*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

A. D. H. J. Concerned with developing the speaking skills of the prospective teacher and with identifying the speech problems which elementary and secondary students may have.

Egland, George O. *Speech and Language Problems: A Guide for the Classroom Teacher*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

H. Offers the classroom teacher guidelines for understanding, detecting, and improving speech and language problems.

Eisenson, Jon, and Mardel Ogilvie. *Speech Correction in the Schools*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1970.

H. Contains a chapter on a communication model for the school clinician and teacher. Also, describes the behavior of children with deviant speech and those with defective speech.

Elashoff, Janet D., and Richard E. Snow, eds. *Pygmalion Reconsidered*. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1971.

P. A detailed critique of *Pygmalion in the Classroom*, which suggests that teachers' expectations of pupils' performance may serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Ellis, H. P., and A. D. Jones. "Anxiety about Lecturing." *Universities Quarterly* 29 (Winter 1974): 91-95.

A. D. Focuses on delivery, content of lecture, social factors of the situation, as well as personal factors which may be sources of anxiety for lecturers.

Erickson, Keith, ed. *Dimensions of Oral Communication Instruction*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1970.

R. Considers such topics as the field of speech, teaching strategies, and the reticent student.

Eskey, David E. "The Case for the Standard Language." Paper presented at the annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1973. ED 086 034.

L. Reviews the controversy over nonstandard dialects in the teaching of English and argues for a commitment to standard English.

Faix, Thomas L. "Listening as a Human Relations Art." *Elementary English* 52 (March 1975): 409-13.

J. Focuses on teaching listening skills to children. Lists a number of objectives to achieve and various activities to reach these objectives.

Feezel, Jerry, Kent Brown, and Carol Valentine. *Annotated Bibliography of Print and Non-Print Resources in Speech Communication: Grades K-12*. Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS Speech Communication Module, Speech Communication Association, 1976.

J. A "must" for those who are concerned with developing speech communication programs K-12.

Felker, Donald W. *Building Positive Self-Concepts*. Minneapolis: Burgess, 1974.

J. P. Considers what the teacher can do to enhance the development of self-esteem among students.

Fenner, Mildred, ed. "Sexism in the Elementary School." *Today's Education* 61 (December 1972): 20-31.

M. A series of articles which focus on various aspects of sexism in the elementary classroom.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

R. Freire argues that a true dialogue must be developed between student and teacher, and speculates on how this objective may be accomplished.

Fitzgerald, Sheila. "Teaching Discussion Skills and Attitudes." *Language Arts* 52 (Nov./Dec. 1975): 1094-96.

J. Discusses informal and planned discussion experiences.

Friedrich, Gustav, Kathleen Galvin, and Cassandra Book. *Growing Together: Classroom Communication*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.

R. Discusses the classroom as a communication system, developing an effective climate in the classroom, and the relationship between classroom communication and learning.

Fessenden, Seth A., et al. *Speech for the Creative Teacher*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1968.

A. D. J. Considers such topics as developing an effective voice, utilizing creative dramatics and choral reading in the class, as well as developing the listening skills of students.

Fink, Albert H. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction in Classes for the Emotion-

ally Handicapped." *Exceptional Children* 38 (February 1972): 469-74.

F. The study suggests wide differences in teacher-pupil behavior.

Flanders, Ned A. "Basic Teaching Skills Derived from a Model of Speaking and Listening." *Journal of Teacher Education* 24 (Spring 1973): 24-37.

F. Demonstrates a broader notion of communication than his earlier works.

Flanders, Ned, and Graham Nuthall, eds. "The Classroom Behavior of Teachers." *International Review of Education* 18 (1972): 427-586.

F. Devoted to research in which classroom behaviors of teachers are described and analyzed. Includes a review of some of the more widely know publications on classroom behavior.

Fostos, Joseph. "A Proposal for Improving Class Discussions: The Frequency-of-Response Chart." *English Journal* 57 (October 1968): 1036-38.

F. Suggests ways for encouraging and keeping track of student responses during class interaction.

Fuller, Frances F., and Brad A. Manning. "Self-Confrontation Reviewed: A Conceptualization for Video Playback in Teacher Education." *Review of Educational Research* 43 (Fall 1973): 469-528.

G. Considers what happens when self-confrontation procedures (via video playback) are used in teacher education. Outcomes, subject characteristics, treatments, and helper characteristics are discussed.

Fraser, D. W. "Classroom Discipline—A Learning Package." Washington, D.C., 1973. ED 100 930.

G. Identifies nine theoretical principles relevant to the resolution of common discipline problems.

Frymier, Jack R., ed. "The Challenge of Nonverbal Awareness." *Theory into Practice* 10 (October 1971): 227-310.

D. A variety of articles focusing on nonverbal communication in the classroom.

_____. "The Value of Play for Learning." *Theory into Practice* 13 (October 1974): 259-317.

M. Q. A variety of articles which focus on the importance of "play" in the classroom.

Fuller, F. F., and C. Case. "Concerns of Teachers: A Manual for Teacher

Educators: Increasing Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Preparation by Considering Teachers' Concerns when Planning Preservice and Inservice Education." Washington, D. C., 1970. ED 040 143.

R. Concerned with providing relevant experiences for those with a minimum of teaching experience. Concentrates on six major concerns of preservice teachers.

Gage, N. L., ed. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

R. A major work with exceptionally good bibliographies on all facets of the teaching-learning process.

Gage, N. L., P. J. Runkel, and B. B. Chatterjee. "Changing Teacher Behavior through Feedback from Pupils: An Application of Equilibrium Theory." In *Readings in the Social Psychology of Education*, ed. W. W. Charters, Jr. and N. L. Gage, pp. 173-81. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.

G. Argues that teachers' behavior can be favorably modified by creating channels for student feedback.

Gall, Meredith. "The Use of Questions in Teaching." *Review of Educational Research* 40 (December 1970): 707-21.

B. The author reviews research which includes: "The Classification of Questions by Type," "Effects of Teachers' Questions on Student Behavior," and "Programs to Change Teachers' Questioning Behavior."

Galvin, Kathleen, and Cassandra Book. *Person-to-Person: An Introduction to Speech Communication*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1974.

J. Designed for use in the high school. Concerned with better understanding the speaker-audience relationship through probing questions, photographs, and case histories.

_____. *Instruction in and about Small Group Discussion*. Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association, 1975.

J. Designed for the classroom teacher in elementary and secondary school.

_____. *Speech Communication: An Interpersonal Approach for Teachers*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1973.

J. One-to-one communication, one-to-group communication, and nonverbal communication are among the focal points of this work. Objectives, as well as suggested activities, will help the teacher in the classroom.

Gamble, Michael, and Teri Gamble. *Oral Interpretation: The Meeting of Self and Literature*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976.

J. Contains a series of involvement exercises that focus attention upon specific aspects of the interpretative process.

Gazda, George M. *Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.

O. Q. Sample chapters include: "The Need for Human Relations Training in Teacher Education," "Ineffective Communication Styles," and "Perceiving and Responding with Empathy."

Gersoni-Stavn, Diana, comp. *Sexism and Youth*. New York: Bowker, 1974.

M. Essays, bibliographies, and lectures which focus on sexist practices within the school.

Ginott, Haim. *Teacher and Child*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

O. R. Concerned with the verbal and nonverbal language of criticism, anger, motivation, praise and cooperation.

Good, Thomas L., et al. "Effects of Teacher Sex and Student Sex on Classroom Interaction." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 65 (August 1973): 74-87.

F. P. Suggests possible differences in the teaching behaviors of male and female teachers, especially in their treatment of male and female students.

Good, Thomas L., and Jere E. Brophy. *Looking in Classrooms*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

P. R. The authors' approach is suggested by a section which considers teachers' expectations. Good and Brophy discuss current research, give practice examples, and discuss "appropriate" teacher expectations.

Gordon, Thomas. *T.E.T.: Teacher Effectiveness Training*. New York: Wyden, 1974.

Q. R. Deals with communication skills needed by teachers to communicate more effectively with students. Stresses selection of messages to suit the situation. Describes Gordon's thirty-hour inservice training program.

Grant, Barbara, and Dorothy Hennings. *The Teacher Moves: An Analysis of Non-Verbal Activity*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

D. A wide-ranging discussion of nonverbal behavior. Topics include "Generating Nonverbal Clues," and "Selecting from among Nonverbal Options."

Halfacre, John D., et al. "Teaching Behavior Modification to Students: Effect upon Student and Teacher Behavior." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1974. ED 099 124.

G. Suggests that students can effectively reduce undesirable teacher behavior.

Harmin, Merrill, and Tom Gregory. *Teaching Is . . .* Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1974.

R. Concerned with teachers in training. A chatty book that includes readings from authorities on the teaching-learning process. Topics include "Learning about Learning," "Dealing with Feelings," and "Presenting Subject Matter."

Harpole, Charles. "ERIC/RCS Report: Gaming and Simulation in Speech Communication Education." *Speech Teacher* 24 (January 1975): 59-64.

Q. Examines simulation and gaming which may be applicable to teaching various subjects in speech communication.

_____. "ERIC/RCS Report: Nonstandard Speech." *Speech Teacher* 24 (September 1975): 226-33.

L. A review of ERIC documents on nonstandard speech. Teacher attitudes and suggestions for changes in teacher training are among the focal points.

Harrison, Barbara G. *Unlearning the Lie: Sexism in School.* New York: Liveright, 1973.

M. An examination of the difficulties in understanding and dealing with the pervasiveness of sex role stereotyping in a private, nonsectarian, parent-teacher cooperative school in New York.

Hawley, Robert C. *Value Exploration through Role Playing: Practical Strategies for Use in the Classroom.* New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975.

Q. Considers role playing as an important teaching strategy. Many practical suggestions are included.

Hawley, Robert C., and Isabel Hawley. *A Handbook of Personal Growth Activities for Classroom Use.* Amherst, Mass.: Education Research Associates, 1972.

Q. Ninety-four activities are listed which focus on such topics as interpersonal relationships and nonverbal and sensory awareness.

Hendricks, Beverly L. "The Move to Power: A Philosophy of Elementary Speech Education." *Speech Teacher* 19 (September 1970): 151-60.

J. A rationale for teaching speech at the elementary school level.

Hendricks, Wilma. "The Development of an Instrument Designed to Determine Teachers' Knowledge and Understanding of Black English." Ed.D. diss., University of Kentucky, 1974. ED 098 618.

L. Describes an instrument designed to determine classroom teachers' knowledge of the rules of black English as identified by linguists.

Henry, George. "Preparing Student Teachers for Teacher-Pupil Interaction in the English Classroom." *English Education* 4 (Spring 1973): 247-58.

F. G. A discussion of teachers in training who study teacher-pupil interaction by trying out an interaction instrument on videotapes of veteran English teachers and then evaluate "live" interaction.

Herbert, John, and Carol Attridge. "A Guide for Developers and Users of Observation Systems and Manuals." *American Educational Research Journal* 12 (Winter 1975): 1-20.

F. A set of criteria was developed to guide users and developers of observational systems and manuals.

Herman, Deldee, and Sharon A. Ratliffe, eds. *The Michigan Speech Association Curriculum Guide Series*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1972.

J. Curriculum guides focusing on a variety of subject areas (debate, discussion, dramatic arts, general speech communication). Useful for elementary and secondary levels. Each guide identifies objectives and suggests activities to accomplish the objectives.

Herrell, James M. "Galatea in the Classroom: Student Expectations Affect Teacher Behavior." Report from the proceedings of the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, 1971. ED 056 331.

P. Suggests that the teachers' presentations may vary as a function of student set. Students expecting a "cold" lecturer "produced" one.

Hoetker, James, and William P. Ahlbrand. "The Persistence of the Recitation: A Review of Observational Studies of Teacher Questioning Behavior." Occasional Paper No. 3. St. Ann, Mo.: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory. ED 036 511.

B. Considers the teacher's monopoly of classroom talk and the high percentage of questions teachers ask which entail student memorization.

Holles, J., and H. A. Jeep. "Group Dynamics in Action." *Clearing House* 41 (December 1966): 203-09.

E. Lists forty-six principles that the teacher may want to consider when working with groups in the classroom.

Holmes, Monica, Douglas Holmes, and Judith Field. *The Therapeutic Classroom*. New York: Jason Aronson, 1974.

O. R. Argues that despite past failures, students are not incapable of succeeding. The major components of a therapeutic classroom model focus on developing effective interpersonal relationships between the teacher and students.

Holt, John. *How Children Fail*. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1967.

R. Concerned with a number of communication problems within the classroom. See "Fear and Failure."

_____. *How Children Learn*. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1967.

K. R. In part concerned with the relationship between talking and learning in the classroom.

Hopper, Robert. "Communicative Development and Children's Responses to Questions." *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 1-9.

B. K. Explains various aspects of communicative development in children as such development is reflected by abilities to respond appropriately to questions in quasi-experimental communicative situations.

_____. "Expanding the Notion of Competence: Implications for Elementary School Programs." *Speech Teacher* 20 (January 1971): 29-35.

K. The author argues that the concept "linguistic competence" is too narrow in focus to provide a rationale for elementary speech programs.

_____. "Is Deprivation Linguistic? Suggested Changes for Teacher Training Programs Concerned with Black English." Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, New York, 1973. ED 085 801.

L. Argues that students should be taught to be eloquent in varied communicative situations.

Hopper, Robert, and Rita Naremore. *Children's Speech : A Practical Introduction to Communication Development*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

K. Considers children's speech as a biological process, as well as specific aspects of language acquisition and development. Considers current educational problems.

Houston, Robert W. *Performance Education Resources for Performance-Based Education*. Albany, N.Y.: State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, 1973.

Q. Identifies and annotates films, slide-tapes, modules, programmed texts, and multi-media kits for preservice or inservice training.

Huckleberry, Alan W., and Edward S. Strother. *Speech Education for the Elementary Teacher*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

J. Focuses primarily on using a variety of activities involving puppetry, creative dramatics, reading in unison and discussion for enriching the speech program.

Hunkins, Francis P. *Questioning Strategies and Techniques*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

B. Considers the importance of questions in the process of inquiry and identifies question types according to Bloom's taxonomy. Also identifies methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the teacher's and students' question-asking behavior.

Hyman, Ronald T., ed. *Teaching: Vantage Points for Study*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1974.

R. Many useful articles dealing with the teacher as a communicator, the social climate of the classroom, and nonverbal communication

Irwin, Eleanor C. "Facilitating Children's Language Development through Play." *Speech Teacher* 24 (January 1975): 15-23.

J. K. Emphasizes the value of dramatic play in the affective and cognitive growth of the child.

Jackson, Gregg, and Cecilia Cosca. "The Inequality of Educational Opportunity in the Southwest: An Observational Study of Ethnically Mixed Classrooms." *American Educational Research Journal* 11 (Summer 1974): 219-31.

L. The authors suggest that teachers in the Southwest behave differently toward Chicano and Anglo students.

Jackson, Philip. *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

R. Concerned primarily with elementary school classrooms. Draws from studies as well as personal observations.

Jayatilleke, Raja. "Human Relations in the Classroom: An Annotated Bibliography, Supplement 3." ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, No. 40. Columbia University, 1974. ED 102 226.

R. Citations include journal articles, books, and ERIC documents which consider such topics as motivation, student-teacher relationships, classroom environment, ethnic groups, and changing attitudes in the classroom.

Jersild, Arthur. *When Teachers Face Themselves.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1953.

R. Focuses on the relationship between self-understanding and the educational process. Considers such topics as anxiety, loneliness, search for meaning, sex, compassion, and hostility as important areas for teachers to understand about themselves.

Johnson, Carole A., and Inga Kelly. " 'He' and 'She': Changing Language to Fit a Changing World." *Educational Leadership* 32 (May 1975): 527-30.

M. Argues that educators must encourage the use of language which does not exclude persons, either by intent or in effect, on the basis of sex.

Johnson, David L. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction in Bilingual Elementary School Classrooms." 1974. ED 089 900.

L. The author suggests that teachers directed considerable prescriptive control over Mexican-American students.

Johnson, David W. *Reaching Out: Interpersonal Effectiveness and Self-Actualization.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Q. R. The text consists of mini-lectures followed by a number of well-developed exercises.

Johnson, David W., and Frank P. Johnson. *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

E. Q. The authors provide theory and extensive exercises to help develop an understanding of group dynamics and group skills. Also contains sections on "Leading Growth Groups," and "Conducting Skill-Training Exercises."

Johnson, Kenneth G., et al. *Nothing Never Happens.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1974.

Q. R. This teaching-learning package consists of thirty-six games under such headings as "Getting Acquainted" and "Group Interaction and Leadership."

Johnson, Wendell, et al. *Speech Handicapped School Children.* New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

H. Identifies the symptoms and therapy for speech defective children.

Jones, John E., and J. William Pfeiffer. *Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators*. Iowa City, Iowa: University Associates Press, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975.

Q. A wide-ranging collection of structured experiences, instruments, lecturettes, theory and practice papers, resources, bibliographies and book reviews.

Joyce, B., and M. Weil. *Models of Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

R. Models of teaching are described within the following categories: "Social Interaction" (Thelen), "Information Processing" (Bruner), "Personal Sources" (Rogers), and "Behavior Modification" (Skinner).

Kagan, J., ed. *Creativity and Learning*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

K. O. Explores the nature of creativity and the creative person.

Kaufmann, Betsy B. "A Contemporary Review of the Inquiry Method of Teaching and Learning: A Study of Current Definitions and Rationales of the Inquiry Method of Teaching and Learning—1960-70." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1972.

P. A helpful review of ten years of work which has focused on the inquiry method.

Kibler, Robert J., Larry L. Barker, and David T. Miles. *Behavioral Objectives and Instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

R. Concerned with developing behavioral objectives in order that communication between teachers and students may be more effective.

King, Charles E., Robert R. Mayer, and Anne Borders. "Differential Responses to Black and White Males by Female Teachers in a Southern City." *Sociology and Social Research* 57 (July 1973): 482-94.

F. P. L. The authors focus on the impact of a far-reaching school desegregation plan on teacher-pupil interaction at the classroom level.

Kirkton, Carole M. "Class Discussion and the Craft of Questioning." NCTE/ERIC Summaries and Sources. *English Journal* 60 (March 1971): 408-14.

B. E. Lists documents which in part focus on asking the right question, and how to ask questions.

Kleiman, David C. "Teacher- Student Interaction in the Classroom." A Selected Annotated Basic Bibliography. Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association, 1975.

R. Identifies a number of basic resources that the teacher educator may want to consider in preparing elementary and secondary students for the complexities of classroom teaching.

Klein, Susan S. "Student Influence on Teacher Behavior." *American Educational Research Journal* 8 (May 1971): 403-22.

G. The author suggests that the classroom can become more productive if students are taught how their behavior may influence the teacher's behavior.

Kleinfeld, J. J. "Effects of Nonverbal Warmth on the Learning of Eskimo and White Students." *Journal of Social Psychology* 92 (February 1974): 3-9.

D. Suggests that a nonverbally warm style of teaching increases learning.

Krathwohl, David R., B. S. Bloom, and B. B. Masia. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Affective Domain: Handbook II.* New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

O. R. An essential work which focuses on interests, attitudes, and values in the classroom.

Kourilsky, Marilyn. "The Anatomy of a Dead Lecture." *Clearing House* 46 (September 1971): 20-26.

A. Describes the lecture aspects of the teaching act. Identifies sources of communication breakdown and discusses the implications of such breakdowns for effective teaching.

Kress, G. C., et al. "Training Teachers to Recognize and Manage Social and Emotional Problems in the Classroom." *Journal of Teacher Education* 19 (1968): 477-85.

G. O. A discussion of programs designed to train teachers to use a variety of techniques in coping with problems in the classroom.

Krupar, Karen. *Communication Games.* New York: Free Press, 1973.

Q. Lists thirty-three games which emphasize such areas as self-awareness, perception, and listening.

Leeper, Robert R., ed. "Human Relations Curriculum—Teaching Students to Care and Feel and Relate." *Educational Leadership* 32 (October 1974): 3-46.

O. A series of articles which focus on enhancing human relationships through affective goals in education.

Leubitz, Lois. *Nonverbal Communication: A Resource Package for Teachers.* Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co.

J. This package includes explanatory texts, visuals, and activities

that will be useful for teaching nonverbal communication in the elementary and secondary classroom.

Lightfoot, Sara. "Politics and Reasoning: Through the Eyes of Teachers and Children." *Harvard Educational Review* 43 (May 1973): 197-244.

F. The author discusses the relationship between the levels of political consciousness of black teachers and the social and cognitive development of second-grade black children.

Ligons, Claudette. "Non-Verbal Communication and the Affective Domain." Washington, D.C., 1973. ED 095 150.

D. O. Q. A training package which provides an opportunity to consider how the teacher relates feelings to others nonverbally. Included are readings, activities, and individual exercises.

Litsey, D. M., "Small-Group Training and the English Classroom." *English Journal* 58 (September 1969): 920-27.

J. Suggests a number of different assignments the teacher may utilize with students working in small groups.

Lusty, Beverly L., and Barbara S. Wood "Effects of an NDEA Institute upon Attitudes of Inner-City Elementary Teachers." *Speech Teacher* 18 (September 1969): 217-22.

G. Considers an NDEA Institute offered for non-speech teachers. Identifies a number of positive changes as a result of the program.

Lynn, Elizabeth M. "A National Survey of Graduate Courses in Classroom Communication Theory and Skills Available to Practicing Elementary and Secondary Teachers." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1974.

R. The author surveys NCATE teacher-training institutions in order to determine the nature of graduate courses in classroom communication available to practicing elementary and secondary teachers. A discussion of four model programs is included.

Lynn, Elizabeth M., and Kurt W. Ritter, eds. "Classroom Communication: A Flexible Teacher Training Program in Interpersonal Communication." Indiana University, 1972. ED 079 793.

R. A lengthy annotated bibliography which focuses on such topics as "Rationale for Studying Classroom Communication," "Barriers to Classroom Communication," and "Communication Models." Included are exercises and films that the teacher educator may want to use.

Marckwardt, Albert H., ed. *Linguistics in School Programs: The Sixty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

K. Considers such topics as "The Dimensions of Language," "Language and Learning," and "Contributions of Linguistics to Reading and Spelling."

Mager, Robert F. *Preparing Instructional Objectives.* Palo Alto, Ca.: Fearon, 1962.

R. Focuses on developing behavioral objectives in order that communication between teachers and students may be more effective.

Marikean, Alexandria. "The Levels of Questioning and Their Effects upon Student Performance above the Knowledge Level of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives." Bloomington: Indiana University, 1973. ED 091 248.

B. Considers an elementary science unit and suggests that teachers may not be able to critically stimulate the students until they reach the formal operational state of Piaget's schemata.

Marino, Ronald Joseph. "The Effects of a Concentrated In-Service Program Designed to Improve Elementary Teachers' Attitudes toward Children." Ph.D. diss., Michigan State University, 1971.

G. A good how-to-do-it guide for constructing a course designed to change teacher attitudes.

Markgraf, Bruce Richard. "A Survey of Listening Pedagogy in American Teacher-Training Institutions." Doctoral diss., University of Wisconsin, 1960. *Dissertation Abstracts* 21 (#3): 699.

C. The only descriptive research of this nature.

Martin, R. G. "Communication and the Act of Teaching: A Footnote to Models of Teaching." *Journal of Teacher Education* 22 (Winter 1971), 428-25.

R. The author argues that knowledge and understanding about communication principles is an essential prerequisite for understanding the nature of the teaching-learning process in the classroom.

McCaslin, Nellie. *Creative Dramatics in the Classroom.* 2nd ed. New York: David McKay Co., 1974.

J. Q. A practical text which gives a step-by-step procedure for using creative dramatics in the classroom.

McNeill, Earle D., et al. "Racism and the Helping Relationship: One Method for Increasing Awareness." Paper presented at the American Orthopsychiatric Association, New York, 1973. ED 082 102.

M. This study examines the effects of a white, middle and upper-class preference system on the helping relationship.

Meacham, Merle L. "All Those Independent Variables." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1974. ED 100 516.

G. A case study of a sixth grade class. The teacher referred himself and the class for help on behavioral management.

Meacham, Merle L., and Allen E. Wiesen. *Changing Classroom Behavior*. 2nd ed. New York: Intext Publishing Co., 1974.

G. One section of the text identifies specific learning principles which can be applied to enhance learning and reduce disruption.

Mendels, Glen E., and James P. Flanders. "Teachers' Expectations and Pupil Performance." *American Educational Research Journal* 10 (Summer 1973): 203-12.

P. The existence of potent teacher expectancies was not demonstrated by this study.

Mial, Dorothy. "Appendix F: Interpersonal Competencies." *A Competency-Based, Field-Centered Systems-Approach to Elementary Teacher Education*. Final Report, Vol. 2, pp. 110-15. ED 026 311.

G. Identifies fifteen teacher competencies (proceeding from self-awareness to interpersonal competence) which relate to the production of desired behaviors in children.

Moffett, James. *A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1968.

J. K. Concerned with students as producers of language. Emphasizes small-group discussion and drama as an important part of the curriculum.

Morrison, A., and D. McIntyre, eds. *The Social Psychology of Teaching*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1972.

R. A varied selection which includes "A Conceptual Framework for the Study of the Classroom Group as a Social System," "Interaction Analysis and Inservice Training," and "Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Atmosphere, and Student Behavior."

Naremore, Rita C. "Teachers' Judgments of Children's Speech: A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes." *Speech Monographs* 38 (March 1971): 17-27.

P. R. The study involved analyses and interpretations of scalar responses that inner-city teachers gave to taped samples of children of varying social status, ethnicity, and sex.

Nash, Roy. *Classrooms Observed: The Teacher's Perception and the Pupil's Performance*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

N. P. In part suggests that a student's self-perception is strongly influenced by the teacher's perceptions of that student.

Neujahr, James L. "Analysis of Teacher-Pupil Interaction in Individualized Instruction: Role Variation and Instructional Format." *AV Communication Review* 22 (Spring 1974): 69-77.

F. The author suggests that as the instructional format is changed, the role of the teacher and pupil change in basic ways.

Newcombe, P. Judson, and Karl F. Robinson. *Teaching Speech Communication*. New York: David McKay Co., 1975.

J. R. While this text is primarily concerned with teaching speech communication at the secondary level, the authors focus on "The Classroom Interactive Process" as well.

Nietzke, Ann. "The Seductive Dr. Fox." *Human Behavior* 3 (October 1974): 42-44.

D. P. Studies suggest that a dynamic teacher may be very influential upon listener judgments.

Oana, Robert G., and Charles F. Eiszler. "Science Modules: Teaching Tactics, Questioning Techniques, Planning Short-Term Teaching Strategies, and Planning Long-Term Teaching Strategies." Mount Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan University, 1975. ED 106 156.

B. G. Centers on competency-based materials in science methods for elementary school teachers.

O'Donnell, Holly. "ERIC/RCS Report: Are You Listening? Are You Listening?" *Language Arts* 52 (Nov./Dec. 1975): 1080-84.

J. Contains references to ERIC publications which may be helpful to the teacher concerned with developing listening skills in elementary students.

O'Leary, K. Daniel, and Susan G. O'Leary. *Classroom Management: The Successful Use of Behavior Modification*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

G. A collection of readings which focus on a set of principles for changing behavior. Research evidence documents efficacy of such procedures in the classroom.

Olmo, Barbara G. "Teaching Students to Ask Questions." *Language Arts* 52 (Nov./Dec. 1975): 1116-19.

B. G. Argues that lessons need to be designed to shift responsibility for asking questions from the teacher to the student.

Osborn, Lynn R. "Speech Communication Education and the American Indian: Challenges and Contrasts." Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association, Honolulu, 1972. ED 070 118.

J. K. Discusses specific aspects of traditional communication behavior unique to American Indians and the implications for the speech communication teacher.

Payne, James I. "Analysis of Teacher-Student Classroom Interaction in Amish and Non-Amish Schools." *School Problems* 19 (Summer 1971): 79-90.

F. Using the Flanders Interaction Analysis System in Amish and non-Amish schools in Pennsylvania, the authors tested the following hypothesis: as sampling moves from Old Order Amish classrooms to non-Amish classrooms there will be a change from direct teacher behavior to indirect teacher behavior.

Pedersen, Douglas J. "Special Report: The Teacher Workshop Program at Penn State." *Today's Speech* 20 (Fall 1972): 55-57.

R. A brief description of the course work in classroom communication offered at Penn State University.

Pfeiffer, William J., and John E. Jones. *A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training*. Iowa City, Iowa: University Associates Press, 1969ff.

Q. Currently five volumes in this work. Concerned primarily with structured experiences for group activities. Goals, group size, time required, physical setting, and the process for implementing each exercise are discussed.

Phillips, Gerald M., David Butt, and Nancy J. Metzger. *Communication in Education: A Rhetoric of Schooling and Learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

R. A wide ranging discussion of the complexities of communication in the classroom. Included are such topics as "Examining Our Assumptions about Speech," "Interpreting Communication Behavior," and "The Clinical Responsibility of the Speech Teacher."

Phillips, Gerald M., et al. *The Development of Oral Communication in the Classroom*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970.

R. Designed for elementary and secondary teachers, this text considers such topics as "Oral Communication and the Classroom Teacher," "Speech and Hearing Defects in the Classroom," and "The Quiet and Noisy Ones in the Classroom."

Phillips, Gerald M., and Nancy J. Metzger. "The Reticent Syndrome: Some Theoretical Considerations about Etiology and Treatment." *Speech Monographs* 40 (August 1973): 220-30.

I. Discusses the results of work with students and suggests treatment systems for reticence.

Poliakoff, L. "Structured Practice in Teaching: A Bibliography of ERIC Documents." Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1971. ED 048 123.

R. A 414-item bibliography concerned with the means and methods school personnel can use to secure structured practice in developing needed skills and insights. Citations include bibliographies, manuals, program descriptions, and research reports.

Ralph, Ruth S. "General Semantics for Inner-City Teachers: A Summer Course." *Etc.* 31 (September 1974): 317-24.

K. Report of a workshop concerned with the relation of language to behavior. Identifies various assignments given to teachers.

Rappaport, Margaret M., and Herbert Rappaport. "The Other Half of the Expectancy Equation: Pygmalion." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67 (August 1975): 531-36.

P. Argues that the focus of educational programs should be the potentially malleable student rather than the sometimes intransigent teacher.

Raths, Louis E., Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. *Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

J. O. Presents value theory and teaching strategies associated with it. Illustrates how to work with students to help clarify their values.

Ratliffe, Sharon A. "Non-Print Resources for Teaching Interpersonal Communication in the Middle School." *Speech Teacher* 23 (March 1974): 173-74.

J. Films and soundstrips useful for teaching are reviewed.

Ratliffe, Sharon A., and Deldee M. Herman. *Adventures in the Lookin'-Glass: Experiencing Communication with Your-Self and Others.* Rev. ed. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1974.

J. Concerned with the young adolescent with a focus on talking, discussing, and listening.

Reid, Loren. *Teaching Speech.* 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

J. Concerned with preparing those teachers who will be teaching speech. Consists of a wide overview of the field.

Robinson, Karl F., and Albert B. Becker. *Effective Speech for the Teacher.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

R. Concerned with teachers in training. Designed to develop greater personal classroom effectiveness. Topics include work on improving the teacher's articulation, pronunciation, physical be-

havior, as well as practice in group discussion and reading from the printed page.

Robinson, W. P., and Susan J. Rackstraw. *A Question of Answers*. Vol. 1. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

B. The concern is with questions and questioning as well as answers and answering.

Rogers, Carl R. *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

R. A classic study of personal growth and creativity.

Rosen, Connie, and Harold Rosen. *The Language of Primary School Children*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1973.

K. Considers school situations which encourage the use of rich and varied language.

Rosenshine, B. "Enthusiastic Teaching: A Research Review." *School Review* 78 (1970): 499-515.

D. Reviews attempts to assess the relationship of enthusiasm to pupil achievement as well as to specify the components of enthusiasm.

_____. "Evaluation of Classroom Instruction." *Review of Educational Research* 40 (April 1970): 279-300.

F. Examines available instruments for the observation of classroom instruction. A useful bibliography is included.

Rosenshine, Barak. *Teaching Behaviours and Student Achievement*. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971.

P. R. The author reviews available studies in which teacher behavior has been studied in relation to student achievement. Topics include "Teacher Approval and Disapproval," "Teacher Flexibility and Variety," and "Amount of Teacher-Student Interaction."

Rosenthal, R., and L. Jacobson. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupil Intellectual Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

P. Argues that teachers' expectations of pupils' performance may serve as self-fulfilling prophecies.

Ruben, Brent D. and Budd, Richard W. *Human Communication Handbook: Simulations and Games*. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden, 1975.

Q. R. Combines basic notions about communication with exer-

cises. Presentation of theory is brief, rules for playing games are clear, and discussion questions and suggestions are helpful.

Rupley, William H. "ERIC/RCS Report: Language Development and Beginning Reading Instruction." *Elementary English* 52 (March 1975): 403-08.

K. Considers a number of studies which examine the relationship between the student's verbal skill and reading ability.

Sanders, Norris M. *Classroom Questions: What Kinds?* New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

B. Identifies types of questions based on Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive objectives. Numerous examples illustrate question types.

Schrank, Jeffrey. *The Seed Catalog: A Guide to Teaching/Learning Materials*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1974.

Q. Identifies numerous types of resource materials for use at all instructional levels. Games, simulations, films, filmstrips, cassettes, and periodicals are among the various categories

Schiack, Gordon McGregor. *Teach Them to Speak: A Language Development Programme in 200 Lessons*. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1972.

J. Concerned with helping teachers develop the oral language skills in children between the ages of four and seven.

Schmuck, Richard A., and Patricia A. Schmuck. *Group Processes in the Classroom*. 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1975.

E. The authors bring together recent research on teaching behavior and research on social psychology and group dynamics.

Sealey, L. G. W., and Vivian Gibbon. *Communication and Learning in the Primary School*. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

K. R. The authors draw from personal experiences to argue that communication is the thread that shapes and unifies primary school activity.

Sieber, Joan E., and Susan B. Crockenberg. "The Teacher and the Anxious Child," Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1970. ED 037 799.

I. Concerned with classroom anxiety in the elementary school and how the teacher may be able to reduce such anxiety.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom*. New York: Random House, 1970.

R. An important work which in part serves to suggest why we need to improve communication between teachers and students.

Sillars, Malcolm O., ed. *Implications of Recent Research for Speech Communication Education: Proceedings of the Sixth Speech Communication Association Summer Conference*. Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association, 1970.

R. Explores the practical implications for classroom teachers of recent research in speech communication.

Simon, Anita, ed. "Interaction Analysis Abroad, Part 1." *Classroom Interaction Newsletter* 7 (December 1971): 1-72.

F. Concerned with broadening the geographical research base, these articles consider classroom interaction studies completed in Latin America and India.

Simon, Anita, and Gil Boyer, eds. *Mirrors for Behavior III: An Anthology of Observational Instruments*. Wyncote, Pa.: Communication Materials Center, 1974.

F. Describes ninety-nine observational systems which cover such phenomena as cognitive and affective processes and nonverbal behavior.

Simon, Sidney B., Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum. *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies*. New York: Holt Publishing Co., 1972.

J. O. The authors are concerned with the process of valuing and how people come to hold beliefs and establish behavior patterns. Numerous exercises are included to help students answer questions that are posed.

Smigelski, Leopold B. "A Comparative Study of Some Humanistic Behaviors of Science Teachers Trained in a Performance Based Teacher Education Program and Those Trained in a Non-Performance Based Program." Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1974. ED 106 115 (abstract only).

R. Teachers trained in PBTE programs were found to be no more or no less humanistic than teachers lacking PBTE training.

Smith, Louis M., and William Geoffrey. *The Complexities of an Urban Classroom: An Analysis toward a General Theory of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

R. Centering on the classroom and school/class interactions, the authors draw from a diary of observations to work toward developing a theory of teaching. A readable book packed with examples.

Solomon, Daniel, and Arthur J. Kendall. "Teachers' Perceptions of and Reactions to Misbehavior in Traditional and Open Classrooms." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67 (August 1975): 528-30.

G. P. Suggests that the two situations may create different norms which may cause teachers to perceive and react differently to objectively similar student behaviors.

Stacey, Judith, Susan Bereaud, and Joan Daniels, eds. *And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism In American Education.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1974.

M. Suggests that the conservative nature of schools and classrooms discriminates against children of both sexes.

Sprague, Jo. "The Reduction of Sexism in Speech Communication Education." *Speech Teacher* 24 (January 1975): 37-45.

M. Argues that male and female students must have the opportunities to explore their full range of human potential.

St. John, Nancy. "Thirty-Six Teachers' Their Characteristics and Outcomes for Black and White Pupils." *American Educational Research Journal* 8 (November 1971): 635-48.

P. For the black students, interpersonally competent teachers contributed significantly to improved reading ability.

Stanford, Gene, and Albert E. Roark. *Human Interaction in Education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

R. Education is seen as occurring as a result of interaction with other human beings. "Learning through Group Discussion," "Role Playing in the Classroom," and "Simulations and Simulation Games," are among the topics covered.

Stanford, Gene, and Barbara Dodds Stanford. *Learning Discussion Skills through Games.* New York: Citation Press, 1969.

J Q. Designed primarily for secondary students in order to develop effective discussion techniques.

Stelzner, Herman, ed. "Language Acquisition." *Today's Speech* 21 (Winter 1973): 11-30.

K. "The Relevance of Oral Language Development to Classroom Teaching," "Speech Processes in the Cognitive Learning of Young Children," and "Competence and Performance in Language Development," are among the articles in this issue.

Stewig, John W. *Spontaneous Drama: A Language Art.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1973.

J. K. Focuses on drama as a means of fostering language growth.

Swaim, Eugene E. "B. F. Skinner and Carl R. Rogers on Behavior and Education." July 1972. ED 098 087.

G. Compares and contrasts Skinner and Rogers with respect to their views on human behavior and education.

Taffel, Suzanne J., et al. "Reasoning and Praise: Their Effects on Academic Behavior." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 66 (June 1974): 291-95.

G. The authors suggest that verbalizing a reason was as effective or more effective than praising second graders for task performance.

Tanner, Fran A. *Creative Communication: Junior High Projects in Acting-Speaking-Oral Reading*. Pocatello, Idaho: Clark Publishing Co., 1973.

J. Presents forty-nine detailed lesson plans in the areas of creative dramatics, general speech, and oral interpretation.

"Teacher Training through the Minicourse." Austin: Texas Information Service, 1972. ED 083 127.

R. An information package designed to answer questions about microteaching. Focuses on questioning techniques, oral language development, and the use of interaction analysis.

Thompson, James J. *Beyond Words: Nonverbal Communication in the Classroom*. New York: Citation Press, 1973.

D. Examines various facts of nonverbal behavior in the classroom. Includes a discussion of personal space, gestures, and touch and their significance in classroom teaching.

Thoresen, Carl E., ed. *Behavior Modification in Education*. Seventy-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

G. Discusses the historical development of behavior modification. Identifies and deals with behavior modification as it relates to education.

Tiedt, Iris M., ed. "Language Learning." Special issue of *Elementary English* 51 (April 1974): 475-546.

K. L. A variety of articles which focus on such topics as dialects, listening and language development, and oral language performance and reading instruction.

_____. "Oral and Aural Language." Special issue of *Elementary English* 51 (Nov./Dec. 1974): 1083-1162.

R. A series of articles, such as "Black Communicative Styles," in which the authors identify various communicative styles of black students in the classroom. See also "A Psycholinguistic Study of the Teacher-Child Relationship."

_____. "Women and Girls." Special issue of *Elementary English* 50 (October 1973): 1019-1101.

M. Includes such articles as "Open Letter to Teachers of Girls," and "Sugar and Spice or Snips and Snails?"

"Today's Changing Roles: An Approach to Non-Sexist Teaching." Teacher Resources with Curriculum Related Activities. 1974. Available from Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, 1156 15th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

M. Provides a resource guide which provides a model for dealing with sex role stereotypes in the classroom.

Todd, Karen R. *Promoting Mental Health in the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers.* Argonne National Lab, Illinois, 1973. ED 084 209.

G. Provides guides designed to help the teacher recognize the need for promoting mental health in the classroom.

Travers, Robert M. W., ed. *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

R. An essential work. Included are such topics as working with students who are "emotionally disturbed," "gifted," and "mentally retarded." See also "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." Exceptional bibliographies are included throughout.

Trubowitz, Sidney. "The Listening Teacher." *Childhood Education* (April/May 1975): 319-22.

C. Suggests ways in which teachers can become better listeners.

Valentine, Carol, ed. "Newsletter." Subscription $2.00 per year. Department of Speech, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

R. A monthly newsletter which identifies films, catalogs, books and other materials which may be of value to those concerned with the speech communication process in the classroom.

Walker, Ed. *Handbook on Inquiry Teaching for Elementary School Social Studies.* Lincoln: Nebraska State Department of Education, 1973. ED 085 307.

B. Written for use by elementary educators as a model for teaching methods as well as the construction of social studies learning activities.

Wallen, John L. "Appendix R: A Basic Communication Skill for Improving Interpersonal Relationships." In *A Competency-Based, Field-Centered Systems-Approach to Elementary Teacher Education.* Final Report, Vol. 3, pp. 135-148. ED 026 323.

Q. R. Contains exercises designed to develop basic communication skills for improving interpersonal relationships of teachers.

Ward, Ted, et al. *Workshop Training Kits.* Vol. I. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973.

G. Describes workshop training kits to be used with severely handicapped children. Included are selected bibliographical references on behavior modification with low functioning children.

Weatherly, Michael. "Commercially Available Games for Speech Communication Courses." *Speech Teacher* 23 (November 1974): 312-19.

Q. Identifies appropriate games for nine areas within the field of speech communication.

Weaver, Richard L. "The Use of Exercises and Games." *Speech Teacher* 23 (November 1974): 302-11.

Q. Discusses three basic concerns in the utilization of exercises and games: selection and preparation, implementation, and evaluation.

Webb, Dwight. "Teacher Sensitivity: Affective Impact on Students." *Journal of Teacher Education* 22 (Winter 1971): 455-59.

G. O. Suggests that lower ability, problem-oriented students are more dependent upon a patient and understanding teacher for a successful school experience than are more able, problem-free students.

Weis, David M., et al. "Dogmatism and the New Inner-City Teacher." *Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education* 13 (September 1974): 2-6.

G. Discusses an inservice workshop designed to reduce teacher anxiety and help the teacher become less dogmatic.

Westbury, Ian, and Arno A. Bellack, eds. *Research into Classroom Processes: Recent Developments and Next Steps.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

R. A collection of articles which includes a focus on "affective variables in the classroom," and "effectiveness of lecturing in the classroom."

Wiemann, Mary O., and John M. Wiemann. *Nonverbal Communication in the Elementary Classroom: A Review of Theory and Research with Exercises for Use in Grades K-8.* SCA/ERIC Theory into Practice Series. Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association, 1975.

J. Focuses on teaching nonverbal communication to K-8 students.

Williams, Frederick, ed. *Language and Poverty*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.

K. L. Sociologists, linguists, psychologists, and educators consider the language of the "poverty child." Included are important articles by Cazden, Baratz, and Labov.

Williams, Frederick, Jack R. Whitehead, and Leslie M. Miller. "Relations between Language Attitudes and Teacher Expectancy." *American Educational Research Journal* 9 (Spring 1972): 263-78.

P. Suggests that teachers' expectations of children's performance in subject matters are partially predictable upon the basis of language attitudes.

Williams, Frederick, Jack Whitehead, and Jane Traupmann. "Teachers' Evaluations of Children's Speech." *Speech Teacher* 20 (November 1971): 247-54.

L. P. The results suggest that teachers will consistently evaluate children's speech and that such evaluations follow along the lines of the two global dimensions of confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness.

Wood, Barbara S. *Children and Communication: Verbal and Nonverbal Language Development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

K. R. The author considers verbal, nonverbal, and situational aspects of the communicative development of children. The primary focus is on communication instruction in the elementary classroom.

Wood, Barbara S., and Julia Curry. "Everyday Talk and School Talk of the City Black Child." *Speech Teacher* 18 (November 1969): 282-96.

L. This study presents evidence of the interaction between social class differences and stylistic variations of the speech situation.

Zintz, Miles. *Education across Cultures*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1969.

L. Concerns the Anglo teacher and the Spanish-American and Indian student.

Zuckerman, David W., and Robert P. Horn. *The Guide to Simulation Games for Education and Training*. Cambridge, Mass.: Information Resources Inc., 1970.

Q. Lists and discusses 404 games and simulations according to age level, supplementary materials, and the purposes of the activity.

Appendixes

A. Schools Selected for Anderson's Study

Western Region of the SCA

Alaska

University of Alaska, College

Arizona

Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff

California

California State College, Long Beach
California State College, Los Angeles
Chico State College, Chico
Fresno State College, Fresno
San Francisco State College, San Francisco
University of the Pacific, Stockton
University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Colorado

Colorado State College, Greeley
University of Colorado, Boulder

Hawaii

University of Hawaii, Honolulu

Idaho

University of Idaho, Moscow

New Mexico

New Mexico State University, University Park

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
Western New Mexico University, Silver City

Oregon

Eastern Oregon College, La Grande

Utah

University of Utah, Salt Lake City

Washington

Central Washington State College, Ellensburg
Eastern Washington State College, Cheney
Fort Wright College, Spokane
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle
University of Washington, Seattle
Western Washington State College, Bellingham

Southern Region of the SCA

Alabama

Auburn University, Auburn
Samford University, Birmingham
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

Georgia

University of Georgia, Athens
Valdosta State College, Valdosta

Kentucky

Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green

Mississippi

Delta State College, Cleveland

North Carolina

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Tennessee

Austin Peay State University, Clarksville
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City
Memphis State University, Memphis
Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro

Texas

Abilene Christian College, Abilene
East Texas State University, Commerce
North Texas State University, Denton
Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches
Texas A and I University, Kingsville
Texas Technological University, Lubbock
West Texas State University, Canyon

Virginia

Madison College, Harrisonburg
Radford College, Radford

Central Region of the SCA

Illinois

Chicago State College, Chicago
Illinois State University, Normal
Northeastern Illinois State College, Chicago
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb
Northwestern University, Evanston
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Wheaton College, Wheaton

Indiana

Ball State University, Muncie
Butler University, Indianapolis
Indiana State University, Terre Haute
Indiana University, Bloomington
St. Mary's College, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame

Iowa

Cornell College, Mt. Vernon
Drake University, Des Moines
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

Michigan

Calvin College, Grand Rapids
Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo

Missouri

Lindenwood College, St. Charles

Nebraska

Chadron State College, Chadron
Kearney State College, Kearney
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
University of Nebraska, Omaha

North Dakota

Dickinson State College, Dickinson
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

Ohio

Miami University, Oxford
University of Toledo, Toledo

Oklahoma

Central State College, Edmond
Northeastern State College, Tahlequah
Northwestern State College, Alva
University of Oklahoma, Norman

South Dakota

Black Hills State College, Spearfish

Wisconsin

Carroll College, Waukesha
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Wisconsin State University, Eau Claire
Wisconsin State University, LaCrosse
Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh
Wisconsin State University, River Falls

Eastern Region of the SCA

Connecticut

Central Connecticut State College, New Britain
Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven

Delaware

University of Delaware, Newark

New York

Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing
Hofstra University, Hempstead
State University of New York, Buffalo
State University of New York, Plattsburgh

Pennsylvania

Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock

West Virginia

Shepherd College, Shepherdstown
West Virginia University, Morgantown

B. Schools Selected for Lynn's Study

Western Region of the SCA

Arizona

Arizona State University, Tempe (2 courses)

California

California State University, Long Beach (2 courses)
California State University, Los Angeles

Colorado

University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Denver, Denver
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley

Idaho

Idaho State University, Pocatello

Nevada

University of Nevada, Reno

Oregon

Oregon College of Education, Monmouth

Utah

Brigham Young University, Provo
University of Utah, Salt Lake City

Washington

Central Washington State College, Ellensburg

Eastern Washington State College, Cheney
Gonzaga University, Spokane
University of Washington, Seattle (3 courses)

Southern Region of the SCA

Alabama

University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
University of South Alabama, Mobile

Arkansas

Henderson State College, Arkadelphia
State College of Arkansas, Conway

Florida

Florida A & M University, Tallahassee (2 courses)
University of Florida, Gainesville

Georgia

University of Georgia, Athens

North Carolina

East Carolina University, Greenville
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Tennessee

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Texas

Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio
Southern Methodist University, Dallas

Central Region of the SCA

Illinois

Bradley University, Peoria
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville

Indiana

Butler University, Indianapolis
Indiana University, Bloomington (4 courses)
Purdue University, West Lafayette

Kansas

Kansas State College, Pittsburg
University of Kansas, Lawrence (2 courses)
Wichita State University, Wichita (2 courses)

Michigan

Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant
Michigan State University, East Lansing
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo (2 courses)

Minnesota

Bemidji State College, Bemidji
Moorhead State College, Moorhead
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud
University of Minnesota, Duluth

Missouri

Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg (2 courses)
Drury College, Springfield

Nebraska

University of Nebraska at Omaha (2 courses)

Ohio

University of Dayton, Dayton
University of Toledo, Toledo

Oklahoma

Northwestern State College, Alva
Southwestern State College, Weatherford

South Dakota

South Dakota State University, Brookings

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee
University of Wisconsin—Stout, Menomonie

Eastern Region of the SCA

Connecticut

Central Connecticut State College, New Britain
Western Connecticut State College, Danbury (3 courses)

Delaware

University of Delaware, Newark

Maryland

University of Maryland, College Park (2 courses)

New Jersey

Kean College of New Jersey, Union
Trenton State College, Trenton

New York

Canisius College, Buffalo
Fordham University, New York City (2 courses)
Hofstra University, Hempstead
State University College, New Paltz
State University of New York, Buffalo
State University College of Arts and Sciences, Plattsburgh

Pennsylvania

Edinboro State College, Edinboro
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana
Kutztown State College, Kutztown
Pennsylvania State University, University Park (3 courses)
University of Scranton, Scranton
Temple University, Philadelphia
West Chester State College, West Chester

Rhode Island

Rhode Island College, Providence